DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 142 UD 011 873

TITLE	Hearings Before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs of the United States Senate, Ninety-Second Congress First Session on Nutrition and Human Needs. Part 5--Implementation of Public Law 91-248, National School Lunch Act of 1970, in Michigan; Lansing, May 25, Detroit, May 26, 1971.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D. C. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.
PUB DATE	May 71
NOTE	241p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Lunch Programs; *Nutrition
IDENTIFIERS	Detroit; Lansing; Michigan; National School Lunch Act Of 1970

ABSTRACT

The record of the hearings includes the testimony of the many witnesses, among whom were Michigan educators, administrators, and food specialists. In addition, material submitted by the witnesses and relevant newspaper articles citations are included in the appendixes. (JW)

ED056142

NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS—1971

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

OF THE

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

PART 5—IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC LAW 91-248, NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT OF 1970, IN MICHIGAN

LANSING, MAY 25, DETROIT, MAY 26, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
58-854 WASHINGTON : 1971

UD011873

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $1.00

ED055145

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota, *Chairman*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana
HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
ALAN CRANSTON, California

CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois
MARLOW W. COOK, Kentucky
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma
RICHARD SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio

KENNETH SCHLOSSBERG, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Page

Letter of March 30, 1971, from Senator Philip A. Hart to Senator George McGovern, chairman, Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs VI

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1971

Opening statement of Senator Hart, presiding 1275

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

Porter, Dr. John W., State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1277
Houseman, Alan W., director, Michigan Legal Services, Detroit 1280
  Prepared statement 1295
Borough, James L., supervisor, Department of Education, School Food Services Section, Lansing 1301
  Prepared statement 1301
Parsaca, Mrs. Richard, chairman, School Lunch Committee of Kent County; accompanied by Mr. Bob Di Mattia, VISTA 1320
Smith, Anthony B., principal, Jefferson Elementary School, Grand Rapids 1331
Runkel, Phillip, superintendent of schools, Grand Rapids; accompanied by Dave Lancashire, food service director 1336

AFTERNOON SESSION

Maki, Alan, organizational secretary, Grand Rapids branch, Young Workers Liberation League 1343
Hengstebeck, James, president, Lansing Schools Education Association 1344
Kitson, E. James, director, food services, Lansing School District 1354
Spink, Edward T., principal, North Elementary School, Lansing 1357
Letts, Mrs. Olivia, area principal, Lansing Public Schools, cochairman of ad hoc committee on school lunch program, Horsebrook School 1360
Partington, Stephen A., superintendent of schools, Lansing School District 1366
Canady, Mrs. Clinton, Jr., member, board of education, Lansing School District 1369
Ebersole, Vernon, Lansing 2371
Hess, Mrs. George, president, Lewton PTA, Lansing 1372
  Survey to parents 1373
  Comment by parents on survey 1374
Smith, Mrs. Gilbert, Lansing 1387

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1971

Mahaffey, Miss Maryann, chairman, Mayor-Common Council Task Force on Hunger and Malnutrition, Detroit 1392
Briggs, Howard W., director, Food Service Department, Detroit Public Schools 1403
  McDonald, Patrick A., president, Detroit Board of Education, prepared statement 1404
Scott, John, Detroit High School student 1418
Thomas, Jim, Detroit Workers Council 1418
Kalish, Martin, president, Organization of School Administrators and Supervisors, Detroit 1420
Wagner, Mrs. Muriel, Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit 1427

AFTERNOON SESSION

Page
McCoy, Mrs. Shirley, school food programs consultant, Wayne County Intermediate School District, Detroit ---- 1430
Jehnsen, Miss Vera, director, School Food Services, Oakland Schools, Pontiac; accompanied by Mrs. Adelaide Tirrell, president, Michigan Schools Service Association, Birmingham ---- 1436
Taylor, Mrs. Erlaine, home curriculum specialist, Field and Field Annex Schools, Neighborhood Education Center, Detroit ---- 1439
  Family Data Sheet, form 4536 ---- 1443
  Vigo County School Corp., request for free or reduced price lunch, form II–F1 1/23/68 ---- 1444
Doyle, Dennis M., Midwest Regional Director, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Detroit ---- 1445
Ruggles, John, chairman, Michigan Community Action Agency Administrators Association, Barryton, Mich.; accompanied by J. Cris Grier, chairman, Five-Cap, Inc.; David A. Goldberg, consultant to Control Systems Research, Inc.; Edward P. Revis, executive director, O.C.C.E.O.; and, Jack Call, Michigan Economic Opportunity Office ---- 1455
Riordan, Mary Ellen, president, Detroit Federation of Teachers ---- 1465
Black, Bill, Detroit Chronicle ---- 1469
Dodge, Henry, chairman, Northwest Detroit Council of City and Consumer Associations ---- 1472
Ehrle, Lynn, vice president, Consumer Alliance of Michigan ---- 1475

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1. Items pertinent to the Lansing hearing:
  Item 1—Material supplied by the witnesses:
    From Alan W. Houseman:
      From the Clearinghouse Review of January 1971:
        I. Implementation of school lunch programs ---- 1479
        II. The provision of free lunches to needy children ---- 1485
        III. Discrimination against free lunch recipients ---- 1490
        IV. Conclusion ---- 1491
      In the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan Southern Division, Civil Action No. 33367:
        Affidavit of Dr. T. N. Evans ---- 1491
      Cost of free lunches to indigent students, from Howard W. Briggs ---- 1492
      Upper Peninsula Legal Services, Inc., re. school lunch program ---- 1492
    From James L. Borough:
      Michigan Department of Education, school food services section:
        Appendix A ---- 1494
        Appendix B ---- 1495
        Appendix C ---- 1495
    From Phillip Runkel:
      Statistics relevant to the national school lunch program in the Grand Rapids public schools at this point in time ---- 1496
    From E. James Kitson:
      School lunch reimbursement rates ---- 1496
      Memorandum—Michigan Department of Education ---- 1497
  Item 2—Newspaper articles:
    Lansing State Journal, March 13, 1971:
      School Hot Lunch Program Postponed ---- 1498
    Lansing State Journal, May 25, 1971:
      Porter Urges School Meals ---- 1499
    Detroit News, May 26, 1971:
      Hart Says State Is Lagging on School Lunch Program ---- 1499
    Detroit Free Press, May 26, 1971:
      Legislature Blamed for Lag in School Lunch Plan ---- 1501

Appendix 2. Items pertinent to the Detroit hearing:
  Item 1—Material supplied by the witnesses:
    From Howard W. Briggs:
      Page
      Re Michigan Hearings Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs 1503
      Request for school lunch, current application, form 34 1504
      Letter to parents, from superintendent of schools 1505
      Free lunch guidelines, effective April 1, 1971 1506
    From Dennis M. Doyle:
      USDA estimates of needy children in national school lunch program schools eligible for and reached with free or reduced price lunches—March 1971 1506
      Cumulative report on financial assistance for child nutrition programs in Michigan; supplied by Richard Lyng, USDA 1507
    From J. Cris Grier:
      Letter of May 12, 1971, to director, Food Stamp Division, USDA 1508
  Item 2—Material from other than witnesses:
    From Mrs. Denise Lewis, secretary-director, Commission on Community Relations, Detroit:
      Letter of June 3, 1971, from Philip A. Hart, acknowledging commission's remarks 1509
      Commission's remarks 1509
    From Mrs. Irene H. Svilokos, director, Food Services, Center Line Public Schools, Center Line, Mich.:
      Letter of May 27, 1971, from Philip A. Hart acknowledging receipt of copy of "The Innovator" 1510
      The Innovator, May 1971, first page 1511
  Item 3—Newspaper articles:
    Detroit Free Press, May 27, 1971:
      School Lunch Failures Cited 1512

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1971.

Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN, *Chairman,*
Senate Select Committee on Nutrition
and Human Needs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are well aware, the School Lunch Program has fallen far short of President Nixon's promise that "by Thanksgiving Day, 1970, no needy child will be without a school lunch." As of last November, less than 70 percent of the needy children, nation-wide, were receiving a school lunch. This national average, however, obscures a much more serious situation in certain states. In Michigan, less than 30 percent of the children were being reached. In Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Oregon, the situation was even worse.

Despite our amendments in the last Congress clarifying and improving the legislation, and despite very substantial increases in appropriations for the current fiscal year, there is no indication of significant improvement in the situation. You will appreciate my concern about this failure to feed hungry children, particularly in a relatively high-income, industrialized state such as Michigan.

It seems to me most important at this time that we focus attention on the obstacles, as seen from the local and state level, that stand in the way of actually getting the food to the children. In addition to our continuing efforts at the federal level, we need to examine the local decision to have or not to have a program, and the conditions under which it will operate.

Consequently, I would be grateful if the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs could conduct public hearings in Michigan at an early date. From my understanding of the situation, it would seem most profitable to do this in Detroit and Lansing, devoting one day to each city. I believe that such hearings would bring to light very useful information that cannot be obtained from our vantage point in Washington, information that may well be applicable to all states.

If you concur in this proposal, Mr. William Beckham of my staff, who is thoroughly versed in the local Michigan scene, will be available to work closely with the staff of the Select Committee on developing plans.

Sincerely,

PHIL HART.

IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC LAW 91-248, NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT OF 1970, IN MICHIGAN

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1971

U.S. Senate,
Select Committee on Nutrition
and Human Needs,
Lansing, Mich.

The Select Committee met, pursuant to call, at 9 a.m., in the auditorium, State Highway Building, State Capitol Complex, Senator Philip A. Hart, presiding.

Present: Senator Philip A. Hart of Michigan.

Staff members present: Gerald S. J. Cassidy, general counsel; John Quinn, professional staff; William Beckham, staff of Senator Hart; Joe Kinney, staff of Senator Henry Bellmon, Oklahoma.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HART, PRESIDING

Senator Hart. The committee will be in order.

First, for the record, let me indicate that this is a hearing, the first of 2 days scheduled for this week in Michigan, of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

Very briefly, this is a committee that was created several years ago by the Senate in an effort to concentrate on the problem of needy children in schools, the best means of reaching them with a meal, what formula most likely could achieve that.

The chairman of the committee and the one who gave the greatest leadership, beyond any doubt, is the Senator from South Dakota, George McGovern. The ranking minority member of the committee is the able Senator from Illinois, Charles Percy. Under Senate rules it is permitted that a Select Committee convene and proceed so long as one member is present.

The purpose of the hearings here in Michigan is certainly not an attempt to find fault with anybody. I am sure I would be a principal target if we went through that effort, but there are figures that indicate that our State, Michigan, has fallen behind the school lunch achievement levels obtained elsewhere in the country.

The Federal Government now funds the national school lunch program at the rate of about $1 billion a year. About $19 million is now going to Michigan. With our population, if we were abreast of the national average, we would be drawing about $40 millon or about twice the current level.

I suspect we will learn that the lag is attributable to a number of reasons: Deficiencies in the Federal law, very likely a principal one, and it is in this area that I certainly cannot escape a share of the blame because, for a number of years, initially by reason of a committee assigned on agriculture, out of which the school feeding program really developed, I have had a leadership responsibility in the Senate for the program. Most of the time I was preoccupied trying to increase the money level, each year attempting to get a larger appropriation, certainly not spending any time to see how the program really was working in the communities of the country.

We have come to Michigan thinking it a good place to measure the deficiencies, to find out what it is that we can do to produce a more encompassing feeding program, because there are only three States in the country that reach a lower percentage of needy children under the School Lunch Act of 1970. That was the act, through the implementation of which, President Nixon pledged we would see a free or reduced price meal to every poor child in the Nation.

The other three States are Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Oregon.

4 Million Poverty Children Dinnerless

Notwithstanding the action by the Congress in the 1970 Act, and the pledge of the President to see that every needy child would have a meal by Thanksgiving, last year, there are about 4 million children in this country in poverty who are not receiving even a minimal meal from the school lunch programs. In Michigan less than half of the children in this category are being reached.

This is one of the cases where you don't have to be a jump-up-and-down kid to wonder whether the system makes sense or at least to question whether the system can deliver, even on things where very few people are opposed to delivering. If there is any issue on which this country is in agreement, it is the desirability of feeding hungry children. Everybody agrees on the goal and it is a goal that we have not yet managed to achieve, so the responsiblity is clear to find why this unsatisfactory resolution to a problem of the nature of which is overwhelmingly compelling to our conscience and our pocketbook.

Probably we will find some of the reasons for our failure yet to achieve the target, some are legal, some mechanical, some are racial, and some just inertia.

I hope beginning here with hearings in Michigan and some later to follow, no doubt, we can identify the reasons and move to correct them.

For the committee, I express appreciation to all of those witnesses who today have volunteered to help us search for that answer.

The general counsel of the committee, who sits to my left, is Mr. Gerald Cassidy, and to my right Mr. William Beckham.

Our first witness, for the benefit of those who are here as witnesses, we have been joined by Mr. Joe Kinney, who is representing the staff of Senator Bellmon of Oklahoma.

We have a long list of witnessess, which is not to complain, but rather to thank all of you for being willing to help.

Has the witness list been made available? Perhaps I should read it and give those who are here as witnesses a rough idea when they might be called because I know many have other responsibilities and there is no need to sit here all day.

Dr. Porter will be our first witness and then Mr. Alan Houseman, Mr. James Borough, Mrs. Richard Parsaca, Mr. Anthony Smith, Mr. Phillip Runkel. It is indicated that a break will be taken at that point for lunch, maybe yes, maybe no.

Then we have Mr. Roger Stephan, Mr. Ed Spink, Mrs. Clinton Canady, Mrs. George Hess, Mr. Steven Partington, and Mrs. James Kitson, Mrs. Gilbert Smith, and Mr. Clarence Rosa.

Dr. Porter, we welcome you.

I am delighted to have a chance to welcome for the committee and the readers of this record, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. John Porter.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN W. PORTER, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Dr. **Porter.** Chairman Hart, your remarks for opening this hearing were most appropriate.

It is a privilege to be here. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Senate Select Committee on behalf of the State Board of Education and the citizens of Michigan.

With your permission, I would like this morning to briefly state the philosophy and the thrust of Michigan's school lunch program, leaving to members of my staff, Mr. James Borough at my left, and others, to give you the specific details that the committee may want.

If I may, I would also commend this committee for its pursuit of facts in regard to a situation that can and must be improved and for bringing to the attention of the public a need that is critical and that requires urgent action.

For far too many years there have been those who looked upon the school lunch program as incidental or an inconvenience rather than as a necessary part of a child's total school experience. You and I know that this attitude is rapidly changing; because of your efforts over the decade of the sixties to change it, we are seeing rapid progress. But, today, hunger in America is a major issue. It should be of critical concern to all of us, and rightly so. Indeed, it is paradoxical that this Nation today—a Nation with a gross national product of more than $1 trillion—must also admit to having millions of American children who are considered to be malnourished.

NO CHILD SHOULD BE HUNGRY

I strongly subscribe to and believe in the concept that there ought not to be one hungry child in this State or Nation. And, as I look at the delivery of elementary and secondary educational services, there are four questions I invariably ask school personnel:

(1) What kind of student performance measures are available?

(2) What kind of student physical fitness programs are available?

(3) What kind of student health services are available? And, just as importantly,

(4) What kind of student food services are available?

I ask these questions, and I know these are the questions the select committee wants to ask, because, if the educational system is to achieve optimum accomplishments, regardless of socioeconomic level of the families, or students in the school community, the children and youth must be healthy and they must be properly nourished.

There are many who feel that the elimination of child hunger is, indeed, a public responsiblity and that comprehensive school food services must become an integral part of the total educational program. This certainly is my position.

There may be a number of educators who appear throughout the day of this hearing and who feel, and proably with some reason, that serving breakfast or hot lunches is not a function or responsibility of the schools. I would remind those individuals, however, that in the past when we spoke of the education of the "whole" child, we failed to take into account that if a child is hungry, he is not a "whole" child. We failed to take into account that education is not an end in and of itself, it is a means to some ends, but just having three square meals a day is, indeed, an end in and of itself for many families.

A hungry child cannot concentrate often on his studies. He cannot attack the day's lessons with desire and enthusiasm. A hungry child's attention sometimes lags and wavers. A hungry child too often can only feel the nagging pangs of hunger and listlessness and restlessness and, therefore, creates a nuisance in the classroom.

The President's Committee on Mental Retardation in its latest report issued just 3 months ago, "MR 70, The Decisive Decade," declared flatly that, "Malnutrition and undernutrition are major causes of impaired human mental development."

The report states:

> The evidence that poor nutrition in mother and child causes mental retardation, as well as other major handicaps, is so overwhelming, that it is time to stop quibbling over incomplete-as-yet research on the permanency of poor nutrition's effect on human beings. It is time, and past time, to get on with the essential work of preventing a cause of mental retardation that is both so extensive and so possible to eradicate in the United States.

Bill Introduced for Free Lunches To All

I know that the Congress is very much aware of this situation and the hearings that this committee is conducting are only one indication of that concern. It is my understanding that Representative Perkins has introduced a bill that would make free lunches available to every youngster attending school. I have no idea what the cost of such a program would be, but what better way to invest some of our tax dollars?

In Michigan I believe we are doing a creditable job, although we are lagging behind, but it goes without saying that we can do much better. Average daily enrollment in our Michigan schools is about 2 million. Of this number, only a little more than 600,000 lunches are provided to about one-quarter of our young people who are participating daily in the school lunch program, in about 300 of our 528 K-12 school districts.

During this same period, only a little more than 250,000 breakfasts will have been served in some 160 schools involving only 30 school districts all over the State. These breakfasts are being served primarily to needy elementary youngsters.

I believe it is important that both of these programs be expanded, expanded to respond to diet deficiencies, not necessarily expanded in every school building of the State just for the sake of saying a breakfast or hot lunch program is in operation, but expanded consistent with demonstrated need.

It is highly probable that in some affluent communities there need not be such a program but it is, by the same token, highly probable that some type of breakfast and hot lunch program should be made available in these communities for those few youngsters who need such nourishment.

I can remember in the thirties when a half pint of milk and a half a graham cracker was available in the morning for every child, but even that doesn't exist in the schools today.

The amount of funds involved in the total school lunch and special milk programs this year will come to almost $20 million. These are all Federal moneys, I would remind the committee. Michigan, as yet, has not appropriated funds to the support of these programs, other than moneys in the Department of Education budget for administration, and this amounts to only about $75,000. We hope that our legislature will focus on this problem. We have requested an appropriation of $10 million to supplement the Federal efforts.

SET GOALS FOR MICHIGAN CHILDREN

There are some goals we can set for Michigan and there are some directions in which we can go.

First, I believe that every youngster attending public school should have the opportunity for a nutritious lunch, particularly those youngsters who are poor and need the nourishment.

Second, I believe we can and should move more vigorously toward providing breakfast for those youngsters who are economically disadvantaged.

Third, I believe we should begin to consider for future discussions the feasibility of not only providing breakfast and lunch, but also supper for those children who have no other way of obtaining such a meal. This would truly be the full implementation of the "community school concept" begun many years ago in Flint, Mich.

Furthermore, I believe we need to keep the cost of our school lunches within the financial reach of our school children and their families. The average cost for lunch at an elementary school is approximately 33 cents today, at the secondary level it runs a bit more than 40 cents a day. In far too many cases, according to information in our office, even this relatively small cost seems too much for many families. School lunches at any level, I would recommend to the committee, it seems to me, should be no more than 25 cents to those who can afford to pay.

Over a period of many years the Federal Government for good and sound reasons have seen fit to subsidize many programs to bolster the general welfare and well-being of this Nation. I know of no more worthy an endeavor than the elimination of hunger among our children and youth. Continued support and expansion of the school lunch program would be in keeping within the traditional concerns of Congress.

I, therefore, have welcomed this opportunity to appear before the select committee and present this testimony.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you, doctor. You have given us the basic figures upon which I think we ought to build today and tomorrow. Let me state them to you again for the record, to make sure we interpret them correctly.

You say the daily enrollment, the average daily enrollment in Michigan, that is, both primary and secondary schools?

Dr. **Porter**. That is right.

Senator **Hart**. Is about 2 million. About 600,000 lunches were provided and these were provided in about 300 of some 525 school districts.

In the matter of breakfasts now, a little more than 250,000 breakfasts. These are being served in some 160 schools in 30 school districts?

Dr. **Porter**. That is correct.

Senator **Hart**. That is, 30 school districts of a total of 528?

Dr. **Porter**. Yes.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you very much for a solid endorsement of the concept and support of the proposition that this society of ours should be able to insure at least each child, who would not otherwise be able to get a lunch and a breakfast, and you suggest as a goal that we insure that that child not go without dinner, too, and supper.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. **Cassidy**. I have no questions.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. **Kinney**. I have no questions.

Senator **Hart**. Doctor, thank you very much.

Dr. **Porter**. Thank you, Senator.

Senator **Hart**. Our next witness will be the director of Michigan Legal Services, Mr. Alan W. Houseman.

Mr. Houseman. Good morning.

STATEMENT OF ALAN W. HOUSEMAN, DIRECTOR, MICHIGAN LEGAL SERVICES, DETROIT

Mr. **Houseman**. Senator Hart and members of the Selective Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, my name is Alan W. Houseman. I am director of the Michigan Legal Services Assistance program. I am also an adjunct professor of law at Wayne State University Law School. I lecture at the University of Michigan and the University of Detroit Law Schools, where I teach welfare law and urban problems and courses of that nature. In addition I have, during the past several years, assisted in representing numerous welfare organizations and school lunch committees around the State who have been very concerned with the school lunch situation in Michigan, Grand Rapids, and Detroit.

Last year I was chief counsel in a case which attacked the failure of the Detroit school lunch program to properly provide school lunches to all the low-income students in Detroit, and to expend the eligibility standards of free and reduced price lunches. In addition, I assisted in the efforts which were made in Grand Rapids which Mrs. Parsaca will spend a great deal of time discussing.

Attached to the testimony which I have prepared are copies of the papers in that suit, a manual on school lunches, which I prepared for Legal Services attorneys around the State, several copies of the articles by the leading lawyer in the field, a lawyer by the name of Ronald Pollack, who directs the Food Research and Action Center, several copies of an affidavit in our Detroit case which may bring to this committee some new medical evidence, and several copies of a letter from a Legal Services attorney who describes the situation in Michigan in the Upper Peninsula.

PLEDGES STILL TO BE FULFILLED

We are here today, as Dr. Porter indicated, to focus on ways to assure that all needy children in the United States, including those in Michigan, and more particularly those in Michigan, receive a proper nutritional diet. In short, that hungry kids be fed. It is obvious that the school lunch program is a benefit to our children. Indeed, it provides a direct subsidy to the more affluent children. The priority of the program since its inception has been to feed those children from families whose income is too small to give children of those families proper nutrition. This concern has been expressed many times by the President of the United States. In fact, last year at the White House Conference on Food and Nutrition, President Nixon pledged that every needy child would be provided with free lunches by Thanksgiving of 1970. When he signed the new amendments to the National School Lunch Act, he promised that the legislation would insure that every child in a family whose income falls below the poverty line will receive a free or reduced price lunch. We obviously know neither of these pledges has come true, at least today.

In Michigan, which is the center of agriculture and industrial productivity in this Nation, and I should highlight the agricultural productivity because many people do not realize it is one of the leading States in agricultural productivity, in Michigan thousands of hungry kids, as Dr. Porter said, do not receive any school lunches. It is estimated that there are about 300,000 children who are living at or below the poverty level and only approximately 118,000 are today receiving free or reduced price lunches.

In Detroit the record reveals a sorry state of affairs, until very recently. The number of meals served between 1960 and 1969 actually decreased. I have attached some figures provided to me in our litigation by Howard Briggs, who is head of the school lunch program in Detroit—he is in the audience today, will be testifying tomorrow—which reflect this decrease. It was only recently that Detroit began providing school lunches at the same rate it was providing them in the 1960's.

There are two principal reasons for the situation that exists in Michigan and throughout the United States. They are very obvious.

The first is many schools in Michigan have no school lunch program of any kind, no kitchen facilities, no satellite program, no catering service available, not even a cold lunch service. Indeed, 86 districts in Michigan, according to my figures, including such districts as the River Rouge School District where the Ford plants are, have no program whatsoever.

Many of the elementary schools in district who have programs, typically the elementary schools attended by low-income students, have no school lunch operation. In Detroit, for example, prior to this year, of the 126 schools receiving title I funds under the Elementary, Secondary and Education Act, 51 did not have a school lunch program until this fall. Until this fall, 148 elementary schools had no program.

As a result, I believe, of our litigation and also because of new Federal funding and the pressures brought in Detroit by the State department of education, and the efforts made by Howard Briggs, Detroit has added 55 schools to the program since last spring, and with only one exception has now provided lunch service to every title I school in the city of Detroit.

The situation in Grand Rapids will be described by Mrs. Parsaca, although I believe they have attempted to provide a lunch service in every title I school.

Local Schools Fail To Meet Need

The second reason that many kids are hungry in Michigan is due to the failure of local schools to provide free or reduced price lunches to the needy kids attending schools with a school lunch program. Again Detroit is illustrative. Prior to our litigation, Detroit set the standards for free lunches—there were no reduced price lunches—set the standards for free lunches just below the income level of public assistance, and in a deposition taken of the Detroit superintendent of schools, Dr. Norman Drachler, he stated that it is the policy of the Detroit board not to provide free lunches to children coming from welfare families. His policy was made in the face of his admission that a significant, substantial number of Detroit children could not pay the purchase price of a lunch.

The same pattern reflected in Grand Rapids; indeed, it was reflected throughout the State. In fact, the State department of education, until the recent amendment, allowed local school boards almost complete discretion in setting their free and reduced price lunch levels, and would accept any standard set out by local schools to determine who was unable to pay, even if the standard was ludicrous.

In addition, many school districts leave the decision on eligibility for free or reduced price lunches to the principals of schools and add additional criteria unrelated to need. Again, Detroit is illustrative. Prior to the recent litigation of new Federal regulations, Detroit left the decision, "to the judgment of the principal" taken from the administrative handbook. Moreover, free lunches were given only after determining if the child could go home for lunch or if the child could bring a suitable lunch from home.

The results were predictable, as Howard Briggs said in a memorandum to the executive deputy superintendent dated May 22, 1969:

> There is no doubt but that the principals are not consistent with one another in their interpretation of this policy. There is a wide range in the number of free lunches served between schools.

Fortunately for Detroit school children the situation has been remedied, at least on paper. But our evidence indicates that that same situation is going on daily around the State. The decisionmaking is left to local schools, to principals; guidelines are not being set by local school boards, the efforts of the State department of education have not been successful.

Adequate Nutrition Related to Ability To Learn

Underlying these two principal problems is the failure of the school personnel, including teachers and administrators, and, indeed, the failure of communities, to recognize the incontrovertible relationship between adequate nutrition and the ability to learn. Dr. Porter made reference to that. Teacher after teacher can relate how kids who are not fed are inattentive, listless, and present difficult problems. But I am talking about a far more important connection between nutrition and education. Evidence is now clear, as this committee is aware, that education achievement and nutrition are directly related.

I have attached a copy of an affidavit which summarizes an investigation of Dr. Evans, professor and chairman of the Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Wayne State University School of Medicine. This actually reflects a study he has done, one of the first objective studies, which related prenatal nutrition to brain size and mentation. In the affidavit he relates nutrition to educational achievement and to the need for a school lunch program.

I would like also to bring to the committee's attention the results of the National Nutrition Survey, which I do not believe has been officially released yet, but some press releases issued by HEW and the Nixon administration were released several weeks ago. I do not believe the entire survey was released, although it should be.

But, according to the reports in the Detroit Free Press and Michigan officials, Michigan had the same kind of problems with nutrition that were encountered in the Southern States. Indeed, surprisingly enough, Michigan led all States in growth retardation. Fifty percent of those surveyed measured a retarded growth. The other results were similar to the States surveyed in the South. Incidentally, the survey noted that deficiency rates dropped sharply as income increased.

The fact is that educational achievement is impossible without adequate nutrition, that proper nutrition is a central factor in education. The school lunch program is an integral part of education, particularly with those children who come from families with low incomes. We must place a higher priority on proper nutrition programs. If we don't, the money we put into education, the money we spend on title I, the money we spend on efforts to upgrade low-income schools will be wasted.

Parents must not oppose a program on the basis of personal values related to home feeding or because they feel other institutions are responsible for feeding school age children. Teachers and school administrators must take a broad view, as did Dr. Porter, and understand that school lunch and breakfast programs are central, not peripheral, to proper education.

I would like to focus briefly on the problems which I indicated were at the heart, failure of Michigan to properly feed needy children in Michigan.

The National School Lunch Act, with recent amendments, requires on January 1 of each year the State must propose a plan showing how they will extend the school lunch program into every school within the State. Moreover, the Department of Agriculture has promulgated a regulation, 7 CFR 245.3, which requires local school boards to provide free or reduced price lunches to every child eligible under the board's criteria, no matter which school that child attends in the district.

Senator McGovern indicated that every needy child shall be served a free or reduced price lunch. That is the law. If that is the law, Michigan is now under a mandate to expand the program into all schools and to provide free or reduced price lunches to every child within the district which operates a school lunch program, regardless of the school that the child attends.

In addition, the National School Lunch Act has always mandated that local school boards establish a school lunch program in neediest schools first. Reference can be made to the briefs which we attached for a fuller development of the legal argument as well as to the article by Mr. Pollack which I attached to this testimony.

Contrary to the mandates of the act, many schools in Michigan are without programs. Almost every school district in Michigan has refused to adhere to the "poverty priority" and has not established programs in the neediest areas first. Indeed, most school districts select schools for inclusion by criteria that are unrelated to economic need or any other relevant indices. For example, in Detroit we found that many needy schools, such as title I schools, with kitchen facilities did not have a program, while more affluent schools without facilities did. We found more affluent schools further from base kitchens—maybe I should explain Detroit operates a satellite program. The satellite program involves a base kitchen in one school. In satellite schools the trucks carry the food from base kitchens to the satellite schools.

We found that more affluent schools further from base kitchens received a lunch program and needy schools closer to base kitchens did not. We found that needy schools on a direct truck line were bypassed for more affluent schools. The selection of schools was not based on lack of facilities, the closeness of base kitchens, or even access to truck routes, but resembled a crazy-quilt pattern developed apparently because applications for the programs were left in the hands of local principals.

NEEDY SCHOOLS SHOULD COME FIRST

That same pattern, in the sense that neediest schools are not being provided school lunches first, is reflected throughout the State. Now, we know there is an obvious reason for this, that is, because many of the low-income schools, that is, schools that are attended by a large number of low-income students, do not have adequate facilities; they were older schools. That is one of the reasons. But the Detroit evidence makes clear that that is not the only reason. Indeed, that may not be the principal reason in many areas.

Buttressing the statutory mandate is the constitutional requirement of equal protection, which, again, I will sketch and make reference to in our legal memorandum, which is attached.

Senator **HART**. This statement and the statement of other witnesses will be printed in full in the record as though given, and, as you go along, you are free to make a summary.

Mr. **HOUSEMAN**. Fine.

It is clear to me that Michigan must take positive steps to implement a school lunch program in every school in the State. Each school district must provide school lunches to all needy children regardless of where they reside. When expanding, school lunches must first be provided to the neediest schools.

Unfortunately, neither local school boards nor the Department of Education are acting in compliance with these mandates. There are several reasons.

First, there is not enough money available to expand the program into all schools, indeed, to expand the program into all needy schools. The State legislature has failed to provide 1 cent for school lunches. All of the State matching comes from local schools boards who are all facing a serious financial crisis, or matching comes from children's pockets, including low-income students.

The amendments to the new act now require, for the first time, a State must match from State revenue the next fiscal year, that matching is 4 percent of the matching share, or approximately $600,000 in Michigan.

There are two bills pending in the State legislature, I think they are in the Appropriations Committee, which would again provide substantial sums of State money. One would provide $10 million, the other $5.5 million. Obviously, these bills must be supported and every effort made to see that they are passed.

STATE MONEY ALONE CAN'T SOLVE PROBLEM

But these State moneys will not alone solve the problem. They will not provide money for the facilities needed; they will not cover the cost of the personnel necessary to run the operation; they will not purchase equipment, trucks; they will not assure that every needy child, including all those on public assistance, receives a free lunch. Unfortunately, once again, new Federal funding is needed. Initially a large amount of capital funds must be made available to provide these physical plants, whether in each school or by a satellite system.

I should mention, there are presently in the legislation some difficulties with providing Federal funds. I don't think they can be provided for construction of facilities. They can only be provided for production, equipment, trucks. The general assistance section, section 4 of the act, must also be increased so that no school can fail to operate a program because the operating costs are too high.

We cannot lose sight of the fact that additional moneys alone will not do the job. The Michigan Department of Education must again see to it that this money is obtained and used to expand the program of the needier schools first. Too often in the past, both the State and local boards failed properly to utilize moneys that were available for expansion of the program. Moreover, no serious monitoring efforts have been established by either local boards or the State department of education to assure that they are not discriminating under the act, and that the act and regulations are being properly implemented, and that school lunch moneys are being expended when available. In short, expansion which is now mandated will not occur without school lunch administrators, school personnel, and teachers putting forth an effort.

Prior to the new amendments under the act, most needy children in Michigan failed to receive a free or reduced price lunch. As I pointed out before, many districts set standards so low only the very destitute, and often not even those, were qualified. The new act has brought many improvements, at least on paper. It certainly sets a context in which we can begin to make improvements.

A good example of what positive changes this act has brought, in combination with our litigation, in combination with the efforts of Howard Briggs in the Detroit school lunch program, can be seen in the experiences in Detroit. Last year the number of free lunches provided varied between 8,000 and 12,000. Most recipients of public assistance were denied a lunch. In February of 1970, for example, Detroit served 11,008 free lunches out of a total of 66,865 lunches, a participation rate of about 16.5 percent. In February of 1971, however, Detroit served an average of 33,255 free and reduced-price lunches, 21,347 of which were free. In addition, Detroit served 6,278 Astro-Pak lunches for 206. Thus, 36.8 percent of those participating in the school lunch program in Detroit now receive a free or reduced-price lunch. Indeed, now they are receiving free lunches.

DETROIT INCREASED FREE LUNCH STANDARDS

Detroit recently increased its standards for free lunches, so that the standards exceed those required by the Department of Agriculture's income poverty guidelines. Beginning April 1, the standard for a family of four is $4,025.

However, there are serious problems remaining. The most serious problem is the regulations issued by the Department of Agriculture, the most serious problem of the free or reduced-price lunch. For those regulations failed to make clear in areas where there is a high cost of living, a standard higher than the income poverty guidelines must be established. If the policy of the new act is not to be frustrated, that policy is to assure that under no circumstances shall those unable to pay be charged for their lunches. If that policy is not to be frustrated, it is clear that a district's standards for providing free and reduced-price meals must be increased if the guidelines inadequately reflect which children cannot pay for their meals. The department of education has failed to make this clear in their communications with the local schools; the Department of Agriculture has continued to overlook this problem when dealing with Michigan.

The new procedural requirements will provide protection and proper notice if they are implemented properly. The most serious problem in Michigan and around the country is the failure of local school boards to implement the new regulations. This is tied in, unfortunately, with the failure of the State department of education to have any effective monitoring systems that accurately determine what is happening. In fact, today in many Michigan communities no notice has been sent out to parents describing the eligibility standards of the free or reduced-price lunch program and the appeal process. In many communities hearings procedures are nonexistent. In many communities application forms have not been revised.

Efforts have been made by the department of education to do something about this, but they have not been enough.

Again, though new moneys are needed to expand the free and reduced-price lunch programs, both State and Federal sources, there must be a resolve on the part of school lunch administrators and school personnel if we are to have compliance with the law and the provisions of free lunches to all those in need.

Obviously, Michigan must first pass the legislation presently pending in the Michigan Legislature. My own feeling in this regard, though the national school lunch program is primarily a Federal program, States do have some duty in this regard to pay part of the money from State revenue sources. I am disturbed when the States have not done it.

CAPITAL COST FUNDS—HIGHEST PRIORITY

The highest priority of Federal legislation, however, has to be the increase of funds for capital costs. If schools are to be added, and if we are to assure that needy children receive lunches, facilities must be constructed and equipment provided. Funding for construction must be made available so that schools can build the necessary facilities, kitchens, and lunchrooms. Possibly the 25-percent matching requirement for nonfood assistance should be eliminated, though I do not believe all funding should be shifted to the Federal level.

Secondly, moneys must be increased for general assistance, as I mentioned before. I would also urge the committee, in considering the new legislation, to attempt to rewrite the reimbursement rates or structure tighter regulations to assure that the poor are provided lunches before the middle class are subsidized.

Third, legislation should mandate, by a date certain, that all schools within a district participating in the program must operate a program, and that all schools within a State must operate a program.

Fourth, legislation must make clear that free or reduced-price lunches are to be provided to all needy children and that in districts with a high cost of living the income poverty guidelines must be increased above the national level.

Finally, more funding and efforts must be made to increase the school breakfast program as Dr. Porter indicated.

The failure of the National School Lunch Act to provide all needy and hungry kids with adequate midday nutrition is clearly seen in Michigan. Until recent litigation and the new act, Michigan's performance was poor, and, indeed, remains poor today. Many schools, particularly elementary schools with large numbers of low-income students, were without programs. Free lunch standards were set below even the public assistance levels. Thousands of Michigan children were hungry and unable to learn.

But changes have begun, and many improvements have been made, such as are in Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Flint, but we are a long way from meeting the goals and the legal requirements of the act. More money, both State and Federal, is needed, but equally important is the need for an increased commitment by school lunch program personnel, by school administrators, by teachers, and by parents. Unfortunately, once again, that effort must begin with administrators and school lunch personnel. The statements of Dr. Porter, the statement that Mr. Borough will probably give, are much welcomed. I do not question their commitment and their effort; what we need now is the resolve to put their words into actual operation.

Thank you.

Senator HART. Thank you, Mr. Houseman.

I think your conclusion, which is one paragraph, probably suggests where we will wind up at the end of tomorrow. I know as a law professor you wouldn't want me to make a judgment now, but my hunch is from the information that the select committee has received, both from written communication and from field observation, together with your statement and the statement of Dr. Porter, all would suggest that is the direction in which the study is moving and the conclusion which probably will be obvious.

WHICH NEEDS CORRECTION THE MOST?

If I could push you just a little. You have recited a variety of shortcomings. If there was just one of those which could be corrected—I am not suggesting our resources are limited to one—but, if there was just one, which one would you want to see us correct?

Mr. HOUSEMAN. I think the one that needs most correction, if we can talk in terms of correcting, is the hardest one to meet, the expanded programs into all the schools, particularly low-income schools that don't have it. The chief priority, it would seem to me now, to the Congress, given new legislation, would be to provide money, capital cost for construction of facilities and production equipment for trucks if they use the satellite feeding system. If nothing else was done, an increased appropriation for nonfood assistance with some legislation providing that that money can be used for construction of facilities would be the chief, the most important thing that could be done, it seems to me. Obviously, tied with that we need to have section foremen for operating expenses, but I think the most important priority would be the provision of money for capital costs, construction, production equipment, so these school districts can begin to provide school lunch programs, particularly in elementary schools, particularly low-income areas, where there are no facilities and equipment.

VARIOUS WAYS TO FACILITATE PROGRAM

There are various ways of doing this. You don't have to build a kitchen in every school. New York City operates a central feeding system, which you are probably aware of. There is one central kitchen and trucks take food out to all the schools in New York City. Detroit uses a satellite feeding system where the base kitchen already in existence provides food to schools in the area. In Detroit, in addition, we may not even need the money for construction, although I think that is the highest priority. They have gone to a cold lunch program. All they needed is eating facilities and some trucks to transport it. I assume that the chief problem, like facilities construction, equipment, there are a vareity of ways, how much cheaper it is to do that.

Senator HART. They claim the additional money for education "is enormous". I am sure there are many people who feel that included in that long list of claims are ones of greater importance in terms of raising the level of the product of our school system than to be specific, trucks, satellite feeding centers, the things you say should have first priority in this food system.

Dr. Porter and you have repeatedly indicated that the product of the system will be a tarnished one if some of the children are not adequately fed. Is that your response to the person who says, "but we need books more than we need a satellite kitchen"? What is your reponse?

Mr. HOUSEMAN. It probably is my response. I would say there is a great deal of Federal money, such as title I money, there is a need in some States, including Michigan, pursuant to the statements, that is going into low-income schools. The problem I have with that money is that, unless kids are fed properly, that money is going to be wasted, it is not going to make the dent that it is supposed to make. That is an unfortunate situation, but that is what the evidence indicates. It is very unfortunate that the schools have to be burdened with school lunch programs and school breakfast programs, but the reality is you can't separate proper nutrition from education.

It seems to me the highest priority, after classroom instruction, possibly after books, has to be the school lunch programs, higher than athletics, higher than some of the cultural programs even. It is a hard and tough thing to say, as a supporter of cultural programs in the schools, but I believe this is true. Our priorities have to be reoriented, at least for the time being, if we are to make any dent in providing education to strictly low-income people in the inner city. After all, we place upon the educational system a tremendous responsibility. We look towards that educational system as maybe the one last chance to provide racial peace in the society, the one last chance to eliminate some of the inequalities that exist.

It is too bad we place so much burden upon that educational system, but without proper nutrition it would be impossible, that if the educational system begins to be what we are saying it should be, otherwise our hopes will never be realized.

SHOULDN'T NUTRITION BE FIRST PRIORITY?

Senator **HART**. This probably is an overstatement. You listed, in order of probable priority, classroom instruction, perhaps books, and then nutrition. Is it outrageous, really, to argue that nutrition, if it would be correct if all the children in our school system were malnourished, then wouldn't you say the first priority would be nutrition?

Mr. **HOUSEMAN**. Maybe I will revise my list. I would say so, and in thinking it over I think I would have to say nutrition may be as important. It is almost necessary to have proper nutrition before you can educate, almost a higher priority.

I am not sure we are at that commitment level yet in our society. It is hard to judge because there are people who have proper nutrition, but it has to be one of the highest priorities in terms of education finances. Michigan is terrible, not a cent. They have to spend at least $900,000 next year, the next fiscal year. Not a cent has been appropriated from State funds, not a cent for school lunch programs. That is just unbelievable, and we are one of the richest States in the United States. The priorities really have to be readjusted.

Senator **HART**. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. **CASSIDY**. Mr. Houseman, many teachers feel that the school lunch program is not a central part of education, and they do not feel that it is part of their job as educators to take a part in the program, to perhaps supervise the program. What is your response to that?

Mr. **HOUSEMAN**. It is a difficult problem. My response has to be similar to the response I made to Senator Hart's question. Education is impossible without proper nutrition. Teachers have to begin to see that proper nutrition is absolutely essential before education can go on, and they have a responsibility in carrying out, assuring that this proper nutrition takes place. It is unfortunate, again, that so much burden has been placed on teachers, but if, indeed, the highest priority and one of the highest priorities is to assure the kids are properly fed so they can learn, that has to be a priority of the school system. The only possible place that this society is willing to provide the funds, to provide the structure, that that can take place. That is the only answer I can give to that.

But it is really crucial that teachers learn and realize the connection between proper nutrition and educational achievement, and see that relationship and operate on that relationship. That is really important.

WHAT COULD ASSURE EQUAL COMPLIANCE?

Mr. **CASSIDY**. In your testimony you stated you were disturbed by the lack of monitoring by local school boards, the State department of education. What do you believe needs to be done to assure that schools and school districts operate a school lunch program in conformity with regulations of the statutes?

Mr. Houseman. The State department of education does not have a monitoring system for lack of personnel in the region that is very effective. They make some field investigations but not very many. They are relying to a heavy extent on the records reported to them by local school boards. Local school board personnel often do not have the personnel to check in to see how local schools operate. They have never set, in many instances, guidelines that are clear and direct, that can be interpreted simply, that lay out the kind of things that have to be done. There is a variety of kinds of things that must be done; lunch, field investigations, double-checking some of the reportings that come in from local school boards, that will take effort and time and personnel to do it, questioning the report, checking on the operations in the schools of complaints by parents or complaints by services, lawyers, and community groups. Basically that is it. It is a difficult problem. I am not sure I have the answer.

Mr. Cassidy. Have you discovered any instances of discriminating against children receiving free or reduced price lunches?

Mr. Houseman. I didn't mention discrimination in my statement, although it is one of the three chief problems that we have tried to address in litigation and it is one of the three chief problems that are normally discussed in terms of school lunches. In Detroit we have been lucky in terms of not finding any serious discrimination against those who use free or reduced price lunches, but in other parts of the State the record has been far more unsatisfactory. Last year I began to receive numerous reports from community workers in the districts in the upper half of the Lower Peninsula and in the Upper Peninsula by other Legal Services attorneys that children were forced to work for their lunches, were forced to go through separate lines. They were forced to get their free lunches or reduced price lunches; they were given different colored tickets.

Efforts Made To Eliminate Discrimination

I think the department of education through Mr. Borough has made very strong efforts to eliminate discrimination, to eliminate the requirement such as working for lunch, but there have been problems in Michigan with discrimination, but not as serious in Michigan as in other States.

Mr. Cassidy. Thank you.

Senator Hart. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. Beckham. One question. I think we all agree, Mr. Houseman, in the connection of nutrition and learning, the question I have is a lot of teachers and school administrators and others involved in the school lunch program complain of the quality of the food, either because of USDA guidelines and requirements or because of the institution preparing the food or for whatever reason. They then go on to say, if nutrition is our concern, we surely don't meet that need in the food, et cetera, because of the school lunch program.

Taking this particular point of view, how do we then continue developing this case of nutrition and learning with school lunch being the delivery system by which to accomplish it?

Mr. Houseman. You raise a rather difficult question to respond to quickly. Mr. Bellheim has spoken to several of us lawyers who are concerned with school lunch litigation and urged us to not overlook the quality of food and the facilities and conditions under which that food is served. The answer that I gave to him in response was that I agreed that optimal nutrition required quality food, required facilities, required a setting which would make eating an enjoyable experience.

The first priority still has to be to get the food into people's stomachs, the kids, I mean. The problems that exist in the school lunch program could only be addressed after we did that, at least not in the first priority. That is a tough thing to say.

The evidence clearly indicates, at least from numerous psychologists that have studied it, that nutrition will not be optimal successful without proper facilities and proper environment, but the priority has to be be to feed hungry kids. Then we can turn our attention to the quality of the food.

Senator Hart. I was distracted for a minute and may have missed the point.

In reply to Mr. Beckham you said that priority must be first to get food to the child and then worry about the quality or kind of food or——

Mr. Houseman. The quality of food, the type the lunch program provides is a nutritionally adequate quality of food. We are talking about the looks of the food, the food coloring, talking about presenting it on plates or presenting it in settings that are more appetizing. Many kids eat food in classrooms which is not the best place to eat foods in some school programs because they don't have facilities available for kitchens.

What I am saying is we have to work about these problems. If we are serious about the problems of nutrition, those problems come after we get food into the schools. We have to try to feed some of the kids, even though we realize that some kids don't care to eat there, but the vidence indicates we get food into the schools at prices that people can afford and people are going to eat. Then we can concern ourselves with this problem. It is a proper concern.

Cold Lunch Less Appetizing

Obviously, I am not suggesting that the food is bad. The type A lunch under the School Lunch Act provides adequate nutrition. Obviously, we have asked to have a hot lunch program, but a cold lunch pogram can provide the same type of nutrition, the same quality or same extent of nutrition as a hot lunch program, but, again, it is less appetizing.

My first priority would be to get a cold lunch program to every kid in Michigan. The second priority would be to get a hot lunch program in a proper setting.

Mr. Beckham. That is my question. You feel, then, the USDA guidelines when it comes to nutritional needs, meet the standards of nutrition for children.

There will be some at this hearing who will refute that number one; and, number 2, there are for some places for good reasons, a lot of teachers, a lot of parents, a lot of people involved in the school lunch program who just don't agree with that particular priority. But, assuming you do this, so that it is one way to feed at school, the cold lunch, you feel, does meet a nutritional need?

Mr. HOUSEMAN. I am not a nutritional expert. I merely rely on the information that is provided. I have talked, I don't know who is going to testify about the quality. I have talked to some of the people who are listed for testimony, Dr. Wagner, Merrill-Palmer, our information is quality of food providing minimum nutritional standards that are necessary, it reaches that.

There is no question that it is important to most people the way it looks, you know. They would like a better quality meal, but it is adequate to get it into the kid's stomachs.

Mr. KINNEY. Mr. Chairman, before I make comments on certain points Mr. Houseman made, I would like to express Senator Bellmon's regrets not to be able to attend these hearings, and to compliment you for getting down to the grass roots of these problems.

Again, I would like to address the point you made here on page 10 of your testimony. In the last paragraph you pointed out for the standards being raised because of an increase in funds, section 4 moneys, or creative use of these funds. I would be concerned about what effect this had on the number of children being served. It would increase. The number of children that we have in attendance increased while we increased the standards?

INCREASED STANDARDS

Mr. HOUSEMAN. An increase in the standards for free or reduced price lunches, it is my understanding, and I can be corrected if I am wrong, that we increased the number of lunches being served in Detroit. It has only been in effect a couple of months, but it is my understanding that during the last year we increased the number of lunches served in Detroit, increasingly raised the standards of free or reduced price lunches.

I think we will see a far greater increase since this is a free lunch standard, which would mean many, many children in Detroit who used to pay 20 cents for a lunch now obtain them free. That, it seems to me, will sharply increase.

I am not sure what the evidence is. I haven't seen statistics to make a firm judgment. My recollection—and Howard should be asked this—it has increased the number of students participating in the program.

Mr. KINNEY. I am concerned more or less with the level of income. Are you saying that, whereas there were fewer people below this level or a greater number of people above the 375, whatever the level was before, we were missing because of the $4,025?

Mr. HOUSEMAN. There were several changes that occurred in Detroit in the statement. The summary left out important factors. Prior to last April, Detroit's standards for free lunches were set below the public assistance levels; they had no reduced price lunches. In April they raised those standards and set a free lunch. Again in September the standards were raised to provide a reduced price lunch standard for a family of four earning less than $4,025, and the free lunch standard somewhat lower. Since April they finally raised the free lunch standard to $4,025.

I haven't seen the statistics. Raising that standard to this level would increase the program. My own feeling is, you know, this level should be much higher. The studies of the Bureau of Labor Statistics have indicated that a family of four can really only survive on the level around $6,500 a year, taking updating into effect, assuming you can take updating of when the studies were done. Obviously, the standards of $4,025 are going to exclude many low-income people who cannot afford a lunch. But Detroit is making a very good effort through this standard of reaching many, many more hungry children and it is doing it, from what I have been told, what the evidence indicates.

Mr. **Kinney.** I have another point. Most people attest to the fact, the need for nutrition depends on how well the child can learn without food. It seems like we still find a number of school districts and a number of schools which, left to the discretion of the principal or the staff, are refusing or for some unknown reason not providing school lunches served to their participants in this system. It seems to me at some point in time we are going to have to reeducate or reorient the people responsible for administering these programs to this particular need.

I would like you to kind of repond to what the attitudes have been to being retrained to this effect so people can understand that the kid can't learn because he is lacking in nutritional value or lack of food.

Mr. **Houseman.** As I said in my statement, we not only need Federal money, State money, we need a resolve on the part of the administrators and the school lunch personnel to attempt to educate administrators and teachers on this relationship. Until recently that was not done.

Mr. Borough is going to testify next on what has been done to make some very good efforts in Michigan in attempting to educate teachers and school administrators on this problem.

Mr. Briggs in Detroit has also been making very good efforts to do so. I don't know whether they are late efforts or not, I am not really prepared to say. They are beginning to do so. They are beginning to work with community action agencies around the State to attempt to educate superintendents and higher school officials on something that just occurred this year.

Primary Responsibility Is Administrators

For the first time Michigan legal services attorneys around the State are concerned about school lunches and are obviously working with community groups who are beginning to be concerned about school lunches. There is a growing concern about school lunches. That is all going to help the educational effort but, again, the primary responsibility has to be with school lunch administrators and with school personnel and they must see it as their task across the country to go out and really urge and work with school administrators to get them to see the need for school lunches.

Probably the best example is this statement of Dr. Porter, who, although he hasn't been in office that long in terms of superintendent, indicates one of the most progressive views of any State superintendent of schools on school lunches. I don't think you could have heard that statement 3 or 4 years ago from anywhere in the United States. Maybe I am wrong, but I don't think so. I think he is an educator and speeches like his, discussions he had led, the efforts he has made, his commitment to this program, are very important.

This has to be followed up, it has to be pushed. It is a long way from having a lot of support within the community and within the school administrators and teachers in this program.

Mr. KINNEY. Thank you.

I wanted to relate that to the recent efforts of the Emergency School Assistance Act which came about as a realization that we were putting the cart before the horse and not trying to implement programs without providing the necessary means to bring about some changes on the part of the people responsible for administering.

Mr. KINNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HART. The fellow who is getting the program he thinks doesn't make sense, even if you give him the money to live on.

Thank you very much.

(The statement of Mr. Houseman is as follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ALAN W. HOUSEMAN

I—INTRODUCTION

Senator Hart and Members of the Selective Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. My name is Alan W. Houseman. I am Director of the Michigan Legal Services Assistance Program, an OEO financed statewide litigation and legislative back-up center assisting local legal services programs and providing legal assistance to organized groups of low-income assistance. I am also an Adjunct Professor of Law at Wayne State University Law School where I teach Urban Legal Problems, Welfare Law and Poverty Law Litigation. I represent or assist in representing the Michigan Welfare Rights Organizations, including Westside Mothers W.R.O., the Grand Rapids School Lunch Committee, and the Committee for a Hungry Child in Detroit. All of these groups have, during the last 3 years, focused attention on the operation of the school lunch programs either in their various locales and on a statewide level. Last year, I represented a group of low-income students and parents from Detroit in *Kennedy et al. v. Detroit Board of Education*, No. 33367 (E.D. Mich. July, 1970), a lawsuit which successfully sought to expand the school lunch program into all of the Title I schools in Detroit which did not have the program and to force the Detroit Board to implement school lunch guidelines that assured free or reduced price lunches to all low-income and needy Detroit children attending a school with a lunch program. It is because of this background and involvement that I am testifying today.

I have attached to this testimony a copy of the papers in that suit, a Manual on school lunches, which I prepared for legal services attorneys in Michigan, and several copies of an article on school lunches by Ronald Pollack, the Director of the Food Research and Action Center, several copies of an affidavit used in our Detroit case, and several copies of a letter from a legal services attorney in the Upper Peninsula which describes the conditions there.

We are here today to focus on ways to assure that all needy children in the United States, including those in Michigan, will receive a proper nutritional diet—that hungry kids will be fed. Though the school lunch programs benefit all children—indeed it provides a direct subsidy to all children including the affluent—the priority of the program is to feed "those children from families whose income is too small to give them proper nutrition." (Congressman Holifield, 79 Cong. Rec. 1468 (1946)). This concern has been expressed at the highest levels of Government. At the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health, President Nixon pledged that every needy child would be provided with free lunches by "Thanksgiving 1970." When he signed the new amendments to the National School Lunch Act, he promised that the "effect of this legislation is to assure that every child from a family whose income falls below the poverty line will receive a free or reduced price lunch."

Yet the fact is that in Michigan—a center of agricultural and industrial productivity in this nation*—thousands of hungry kids do not receive any school lunches. Of the 2.2 million Michigan children attending public school in Michigan, only on an average of 618,422 were being served in the 1970–71 school year. In fact, of the approximately 300,000 children who are living below or at the poverty level, only about 118,362 are today receiving free or reduced price lunches. In Detroit, the Motor City, the record reveals a sorry state of affairs. The number of meals served between 1960–1969 actually decreased. 1,988,297 were served in 1960–61; 125,451 in 1963–64; 377,990 in 1965–66; and 1,409,810 in 1968–69. Whatever the commitments of those who passed the 1946 legislation, or the 1970 amendments, or even of the President of the United States, the school lunch program is not reaching the hungry kids of Michigan.

There are two principal reasons for this tragic situation. First, many schools in Michigan have no school lunch program of any kind—no kitchen facilities, no satellite program, no catering service, not even a cold lunch service. Indeed, 86 districts including the River Rouge School District have no program whatsoever. Many of the elementary schools in districts with programs, and typically the elementary schools attended by low-income students, have no operation. In Detroit, for example, of the 126 schools receiving Title I funds, 51 did not have a school lunch program until this fall; 148 elementary schools had no program. As a result of our litigation and new federal funding, Detroit has added 55 schools to the program since last Spring and with only one exception has provided a lunch service to every Title I school. In Grand Rapids, until this Winter, no Title I elementary school received a lunch program, though all high schools and junior highs had one.

The second reason that many kinds are hungry in Michigan is due to the failure of local schools to provide free or reduced price lunches to the needy kids attending schools with a school lunch program. Again Detroit is illustrative. Prior to our litigation, Detroit set the standards for free lunches (there were no reduced price lunches) just below the income level for public assistance. In a deposition taken of the Detroit Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Norman Drachler stated that the policy of the Detroit Board was to *not* provide free lunches to children coming from welfare families. (Deposition of Dr. Norman Drachler, Nov. 3, 1969, P. 67). This was done even though the Board recognized that most of the children on public assistance, a "significant and substantial" number, could not pay the purchase price. The same pattern was reflected in Grand Rapids. In fact, the State Department of Education, allowed local school boards complete discretion in setting their free and reduced price lunch levels and would accept any standard set out by local schools to determine who were unable to pay even if the standard was ludicrous. (E.g., $100 per year for a family of four).

In addition, many school districts leave the decision on eligibility for free or reduced price lunches to the principals of the schools, an additional criteria, unrelated to need. Again Detroit is illustrative. Prior to the recent litigation and new federal regulations, Detroit left the decision to "the judgment of the principal." (1966 Edition of the Administrative Handbook of the Detroit Public Schools.) Moreover, free lunches were given only after determining if the child could go home for lunch or if the child could bring a suitable lunch from home. The results were predictable as Howard W. Briggs, the Detroit school lunch administrator, stated to the Executive Deputy Superintendent in a memo, dated May 22, 1969:

---

*Michigan is obviously one of the richest industrial states in the United States. What many do not realize is its agricultural productivity. For example, Michigan ranks first in cherries, second in apples, first in winter wheat, etc.

> Presently our policy is stated in general terms, requiring interpretation by the principal. There is no doubt, but that principals are not consistent with one another in their interpretation of this policy. There is wide range in the number of free lunches served between schools in the same geographic and/or economic area.

Fortunately, for Detroit school children, this situation has been remedied, at least on paper.

Underlying these two principal problems is the failure of school personnel, including teachers and administrators, and the failure of parents to recognize the incontrovertible relationship between adequate nutrition and the ability to learn. Teacher after teacher can relate how kids that are not fed are inattentive, listless, and present difficult problems, while kids that have had adequate nutritional intake are much easier to teach and show much more interest in school and education. But I am talking about a far more important connection between nutrition and education. The evidence is *now* clear, as this Committee is aware, that educational achievement and nutrition are directly related. I will not attempt to summarize that evidence—already presented to this committee during the last several years, but I will add some information.

First, I have included in the exhibits attached to this testimony an affidavit prepared by Dr. T. N. Evans, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics at Wayne State University School of Medicine and Department Chairman of Gynecology and Obstetrics at Hutzel Hospital. Dr. Evans has been involved in a study that has directly related prenatal nutrition to brain size and mentation. In the affidavit he makes the following statement based upon his research of inner city Detroiters:

> It is necessary to provide adequate nutrition throughout the growth and development of those from the inner-city so that their children will not start from the same deficiencies in nutrition as found in the study. An adequate school lunch program will help provide the necessary nutrition now lacking in the inner-city children. Given the consumption patterns, lack of food availability, and inadequate finances of inner-city families, many children will not receive adequate nutrition. Providing school lunches may be the only balanced and stable meal they receive. The availability of school lunches to all children, particularly those whose incomes are low, is an essential ingredient of any program to aid the nutritional and educational growth of inner-city children.

Secondly, the results of the National Nutrition Survey, not yet officially released (and apparently not to be released fully under the Nixon administration) but as reported by the Detroit Free Press and Dr. John Isbister of the Michigan Department of Public Health, reveal that Michigan has the same degree of problems encountered in the southern states in growth—Kentucky, Louisiana and Texas. Michigan leads all the states in growth retardation; 50% of those surveyed measured a retarded growth. Other results were as follows: 19% anemia; 22% Vitamin A deficiencies; .4% Vitamin C deficiencies; 4% Vitamin D deficiencies and symptoms of rickets; 40% had biochemical deficiencies and 8% two or more deficiencies. The survey also noted that the deficiency rates dropped sharply as income increased. (See Detroit Free Press, P. 10-A, Thursday, July 2, 1970). Michigan school children are not only hungry but are exhibiting obvious indications of possible severe nutritional deficiencies.

The fact is that educational achievement is impossible without adequate nutrition—that proper nutrition is a central factor in education. The school lunch program—and the school breakfast program as well—are integral parts of education particularly for those children who come from families with low incomes. Unless we place a higher priority on school nutrition programs, the money we put into education—which we now perceive to be so important for the future development of our children and the future harmony of the races and classes in American society—will be wasted. Teachers and school administrators must take a broad view of the school lunch and breakfast programs and begin to understand that they are central—not peripheral—to proper education. Parents must not oppose a program on the basis of personal values related to home feeding or because they feel other institutions are responsible for feeding school age children. School feeding programs must have a priority higher than any other program—except classroom education—which is administered by the public schools.

II—EXPANSION OF THE PROGRAM

Section 11(h)(1) of the National School Lunch Act requires that on January 1 of each year the state must propose a plan showing how they will extend the school lunch program into every school within the state. Moreover, the Department of Agriculture has promulgated a regulation, 7 C.F.R. § 245.3 Subpart (a) which requires local school boards to provide a free or reduced price school lunch to every child eligible under the board's criteria no matter which school that child attends within the district. According to Senator McGovern, interpreting that administrative regulation:

> [T]he regulations now clearly emphasize that when one school in a school district serves lunch, then all other schools in that district must provide equal treatment in nutritional services for all needy children . . . [A]ll is clear now. Every needy child shall be served a free or reduced-price lunch. That is law.116 Cong. Rec. S 16141 (Sept. 22, 1970).

Thus, Michigan is now under a mandate to expand the program into all schools and to provide free or reduced price lunches to every child within a district which operates a school lunch program regardless of the school that child attends.

Moreover, the National School Lunch Act has always mandated that local school boards establish a school lunch program in the neediest schools first—i.e., the schools which have the highest concentration of low-income students. (See Plaintiffs' Post Trial Memorandum in *Kennedy v. Detroit Board of Education*, Pollack, "The National School Lunch Program: Hunger In Our Nation's Classrooms," for a fuller development of this legal position.)

Contrary to the mandates of the Act, many schools are without programs. Also, almost every school district in Michigan has refused to adhere to the "poverty priority" and establish programs in the neediest areas first. Indeed, most districts select schools for inclusion by criteria that are unrelated to need or any other relevant indices. For example, in Detroit, we found that many needy schools (such as Title I schools) with kitchen facilities did not have a program while more affluent schools without facilities did; we found that more affluent schools further from base kitchens (Detroit operates a satellite program) received a lunch program while needy schools closer to base kitchens did not; we found that needy schools on a direct truck line were bypassed for more affluent schools farther away and not on the direct line. The selection of schools was not based on lack of facilities, closeness to base kitchens, or even access to truck routes, but resembled a crazy-quilt pattern developed apparently because applications for the program were left into the hands of local principals.

Buttressing the statutory mandates is the constitutional requirement of equal protection. Children in need, but who are denied a free or reduced price lunch because of the school they attend within a district, are denied equal protection because they are discriminated against arbitrarily and without any relation to the central purpose of the School Lunch Act—the relief of hunger and the consequent improvement of educational opportunities. (See Plaintiffs' Memorandum and the Pollack article for a full development of this legal position.)

It is clear, therefore, that by law Michigan must take positive steps to implement a school lunch program in every school within the state; each school district must provide school lunches to all needy children regardless of where they reside. When expanding, school lunches must first be provided to the neediest schools.

Unfortunately, neither the Michigan Department of Education nor local school boards are acting to meet the mandates of the National School Lunch Act or the Constitution. The reasons are not hard to discover. First is the fact that there is not enough money available to expand the program into all schools—indeed, to expand the program into all needy schools. The State legislature has failed to provide one cent for school lunches; all of the state matching comes from local school boards, who are all facing a serious financial crisis, or from children's pockets. This is a serious shortcoming which has only recently begun to be remedied. The Amendments to the Act now require, for the first time, that states must match from state revenue; for the next fiscal year that matching is 4% of the matching share, or approximately $900,000 for Michigan. There are two bills pending in the State legislature—I believe they are in the Appropriations' Committee of the House—which would begin to provide substantial sums of state money to assist local school districts. HR 4106 would provide $10,000,000; HR 4103 would provide $5½ million. Obviously these bills must be supported and every effort made to see that they are passed. Michigan can no longer lag behind in this vital area.

But these new state monies will not alone solve the program. They will not provide money for the facilities needed; they will not cover the cost of personnel necessary to run the operation; they will not purchase equipment, trucks, etc.; they will not assure that every needy child, including all of those on public assistance, receives a free lunch. New federal fundings is needed. Initially, a large amount of capital funds must be made available to provide the necessary physical plants—whether in each school or by a satellite system. Then, the general assistance section, Section 4, must be increased so that no school can fail to operate a program because the operating costs are too high. Additional monies must be provided under the Child Nutrition Act for school breakfasts.

We should not lose sight of the fact, however, that additional monies alone will not do the job. If we are to assure that each hungry child receives a proper nutrition, and certainly if we are to provide each child with a school lunch, there must be a new resolve on the part of local school boards and the Michigan Department of Education to see that this money is obtained and used to expand the program. Too often in the past, both the state and local boards failed to properly utilize monies that were available for expansion of the program. See e.g., Leonard, Why Child Nutrition Programs Fail (1969) pp. 20, 24; Their Daily Bread—A Study of the National School Lunch Program (1968) pp. 26–27, 52. Moreover, no serious monitoring efforts have been established either by local boards or by the State Department of Education, to assure that schools are providing free lunches to all needy kids, that they are not discriminating, that the Act and regulations are being properly implemented, and that school lunch monies are being expended when available. Expansion—which is now mandated—will not occur without school lunch administrators, school personnel, and teachers putting forth the effort.

III—The Provision of Free Lunches to Needy Children

Prior to the new amendments to the school lunch act, Public Law 91–248, most needy children in Michigan failed to receive a free or reduced price lunch. Many school districts set standards so low that only the very destitute—and often not even them—qualified. The new act has brought many improvements—on paper—and provides a basis for assuring a decent free lunch program.

A good example of what positive changes this act has brought—in combination with our litigation—can be seen from the experiences in Detroit. Last year, the number of free lunches provided varied between approximately 8,000 to 12,000; most recipients of public assistance were denied a lunch. In February of 1970, for example, Detroit served 11,008 free lunches out of a total of 66,865 lunches; a participation rate of 16.5%. In February of 1971, however, Detroit served an average of 33,255 free and reduced price lunches, 21,347 of which were served free. In addition, Detroit served 6,278 Astro-Pack lunches for 206. Thus, 36.8% of those participating received free or reduced price lunches.

Moreover, Detroit recently increased its standards for free lunches so that the standards exceed those required by the Department of Agriculture's income poverty guidelines; in Detroit, beginning April 1, the standard for a family of four is $4,025. This was possible because of new federal funds and a creative use of section 4, and Section 11 funds.

However, serious problems remain. The most serious problem in the regulations issued by the Department of Agriculture is the failure to make clear that in areas with a high cost of living, a standard higher than the income poverty standards must be established. If the policy of the new Act is not to be frustrated—i.e., the intend that "under no circumstances shall those unable to pay be charged for their lunches"*—it is clear that a district's standards for providing free and reduced price meals must be increased if the guidelines inadequately reflect which children cannot pay for their meals. The Department of Education has failed to make this clear in their communications with local school boards; the Department of Agriculture has continued to overlook this problem when dealing with Michigan.

---

*See Joint Senate-House Committee, 91st Cong. 2nd Sess., Report to the 1970 school Lunch Act Amendments 9 (April 29, 1970).

The new procedural requirements will provide protection and proper notice if implemented. The most serious problem in Michigan may well be the failure of local school boards to implement the new regulations. This is tied with the failure of the State Department of Education to have any monitoring system that accurately determines what is happening. In many Michigan communities, no notice has been sent out to parents; hearing procedures are non-existent; application forms have not been revised.

Again, though new monies are needed—from both state and federal funds—there must be a resolve on the part of school lunch administrators and school personnel if we are to have compliance with the law and the provision of free lunches to all those in need.

IV—Legislation and Funding Needed

The first priority for Michigan must be the passage of the state legislation presently pending in the House. Though the National School Lunch program is a national problem, states do have some duty in this regard. Indeed, I would recommend that legislation be enacted at the federal level which would require a greater share of expenditures from state revenues for general operation of the program—possibly 15% matching requirement.

The highest priority of federal legislation—appropriation, however, has to be the increase of funds for capital costs. If schools are to be added and if we are to assure that all needy children receive a lunch, facilities must be constructed and equipment provided. There are several alternatives for a school's construction of kitchens in each school, satellite feeding program as in Detroit, a central feeding program as in New York City, or even a catering program. Funding for construction must be made available so that schools can build the necessary facilities for kitchens and lunchrooms. Possibly the 25% matching requirement for non-food assistance should be eliminated—though I do not believe that all funding should be shifted to the federal level.

Second, monies must be increased for General Assistance—Section 4 of the Act—as well as Section 11 monies for free and reduced price lunches. I would urge this committee not only to increase the appropriations but to rewrite the reimbursement rates to assure that poor are provided lunches before the middle class are subsidized.

Third, legislation must mandate, by a date certain, that all schools within a district participating in the school lunch program must operate a program, and that all schools within a state must operate a program.

Fourth, legislation must make clear that free or reduced price lunches are to be provided to all needy children and that, in districts with a high cost of living, the income poverty guidelines must be increased above the national levels.

Finally, more funding and efforts must be made to increase the school breakfast program.

V—Conclusion

The failure of the National School Lunch Act to provide all needy and hungry kids with adequate mid-day nutrition is clearly seen in Michigan—one of our most prosperious industrial and agricultural states. Until recent litigation and the new act, Michigan's performance was poor. Many schools—particularly elementary schools with large numbers of low income students—were without programs; free lunch standards were set below even the public assistance levels; thousands of Michigan children went hungry and were unable to learn. Though changes have begun, and many improvements have been made—such as in Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Flint—we are a long way from meeting the goals and even the legal requirements of the Act. New money—both state and federal is needed. But equally important is the need for an increased commitment to the school lunch program by school administrators, teachers and parents. Unfortunately, that effort must begin with school administrators and school lunch personnel. The Statements of Dr. Porter and Mr. Borrough are excellent and much welcomed; I do not question their commitment; what we need now is the resolve to put their words into actual operation.

Senator **Hart**. The committee welcomes the supervisor of the Michigan Department of Education School Food Services section, Mr. James Borough.

I have heard you mentioned several times. We welcome you here today.

STATEMENT OF JAMES L. BOROUGH, SUPERVISOR, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES SECTION, LANSING

Mr. **Borough**. Senator Hart, other members of the Select Committee for Nutrition and Human Needs, I would like to add my welcome to you from the State of Michigan. It is a distinct honor and privilege to have you here, even for such an unfortunately short stay.

I believe the Senator knows my position on the lunch program and the feeding of needy children with our association over a period of years. I won't go into that.

I am glad to hear Mr. Houseman testify to some of the things that we have been at least talking and talking hard for a period of years, and I sincerely hope that the time is now approaching when some of these things are going to come to pass.

I would like to say one more thing, and Mr. Houseman is absolutely right when he states that, at least in my experience, there have been few superintendents of public instruction in our State who would have made the statement that was made by Dr. Porter just a few minutes ago, and I think with this kind of leadership it is going to be easier for everybody to pull together to see that the job actually gets done.

I should point out, first of all, that I am not reading the testimony that was provided to you in the interest of time. I think 15 pages would take quite a while. So, with your permission, I have condensed it somewhat.

Is that all right?

Senator **Hart**. Yes; the prepared statement will be printed in the record in full just as though given, and the condensation also.

(The statement above referred to is as follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JAMES L. BOROUGH

Mr. Chairman, and Members of The Senate Select Committee for Nutrition and Human Needs:

"Welcome" to the great state of Michigan. It is a distinct honor and privilege to have you here even for such an unfortunately short stay. We would have liked the opportunity to show you around to give you an opportunity to see some of the things that some people say are not being done in Michigan. It is a singular honor and privilege for me to testify.

I should point out at the outset that my testimony deals only with the public schools. This office does not administer the program for nonpublic schools, and as a consequence all statistical data supplied in conjunction with this testimony is limited to public school data. Complete data are not available, due to the administrative and reporting system.

There are three basic sections to my testimony: (1) to provide some historical and accurate data; (2) to outline a few of the problems that we are facing in Michigan, and we do have a few; and (3) to make a few recommendations for solving them.

There are three items in the appendices: (a) a recap of operations 1970–71 as compared to 1969–70, including recommendations by category of estimated needs for 1971–72; (b) a recap of final funding for 1969–70; and (c) a comparison of program information of the past five years.

I

Without going into the prehistoric era of school food service, which really began back in medieval times, the beginning for many Michigan school districts was the mid-1930s when great surpluses of agricultural commodities were reaching the consumer market. As a means of making good use of this surplus produce, the Congress through the United States Department of Agriculture initiated food purchase programs and distributed many varieties for use in school lunch programs. Many Michigan schools got into the food service business at this time. The real impetus, however, came in the spring of 1946 when the Congress passed the National School Lunch Act, the express purpose of which was and still is to safeguard the health and well-being of our nation's children and to provide for the domestic consumption of our abundant agricultural products and other foods.

The formula for the state allotment of grants-in-aid back in the early days was one which used average per capita income and the number of children eligible to participate in the program. Funds were distributed to the states on the basis of the *school census*. This provided a distinct advantage for those states where average daily participation was low, and Michigan was one of these. With about 15 percent of the children actually taking part in the program and the amount of money based upon the potential customers, there was actually a premium on serving fewer lunches. Michigan was able to offer schools a reimbursement rate of 8 or 9 cents per lunch, when many other states were at 4 or 5 cents.

In addition, a basic philosophy regarding the erection and use of buildings had already been with us for a number of years, i.e., "Build the buildings, particularly the elementary buildings, in the neighborhood areas, close them down at noon, and 'allow' the children to go home for lunch." This has until recently appeared to be the prevailing attitude. At any rate, the Congress, finally convinced of the inequities of the above type of formula, amended the National School Lunch Act, with its first major change in 1961 or 1962.

These amendments changed the census part of the formula to participation rate, which is the number of lunches actually served. At the suggestion of Senator Hart, supported by this office, the Congress also added Section 11 as an amendment to the Act. This was the beginning of providing special assistance to school districts for the service of free or reduced-price lunches to needy children.

Unfortunately, although recognizing the problem in the basic legislation, the Congress failed to implement this authorization with funds. As a result, our regular reimbursement rate was cut from 6 or 7 cents as it was in 1959 and 1960 to 3½ cents in 1964; and in addition, the service of free or reduced-price lunches to needy children was not to be developed due to lack of funding. We were actually hurt in two ways. As a matter of fact, it was at about this same time that Detroit, under a severe austerity program, had to close a great many of its school lunch operations. It was also about this time that the Detroit food service director and I spent one week in Washington vainly looking for funds to set up a central commissary for the re-extension of lunch production in Detroit. Had this been possible, then, much of the current problem would not have been.

The Congress appropriated no funds the first or second years under Section 11 and for the third and fourth years only token amounts. As a consequence, of the total $2.5 million for the first year of operation, Michigan received the grand sum total of $21,216. Special Assistance or demonstration programs were initiated in 17 school districts and 29 schools in spite of the fact that it was necessary to supplement Section 11 funds with badly needed Section 4 funds. Finally, with recognition of the fact that child nutrition was moving ahead too slowly, the Congress passed another innovative act, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. This provided for school breakfasts and nonfood assistance, among other things. Even then, adequate funding was unheard of—$22,000 for needy children and $17,877 for nonfood assistance did not encourage the expansion of food services to any great extent.

I bring all of this out to show that over a period of years many of us have been aware of the problems of child hunger and have been trying not only for adequate financing for the financially needy, but for all hungry children. Unfortunately, now that adequate funding is nearly possible, it is difficult to swing into gear at the drop of a hat. Perhaps, we are not moving ahead fast enough, but within the last two or three months, much progress has been made.

Back in 1968–69, for example, when the first funds began to show up, we were serving in Michigan only 20,000 lunches a day to needy children; this has now reached a total of more than 120,000 a day. In spite of the fact that a number of school districts have dropped out of the program for reasons I will get to later on, we have this year shown a 20–25 percent increase in average daily participation over 1969–70.

The Detroit Public School system has extended its School Lunch Program from secondary schools and a few elementary schools to all poverty-area schools except two, and school lunches are now being served in all but 60 of its 315 schools. The city of Flint has extended its program from secondary schools to elementaries, is now operating in all poverty-area schools, and is currently considering the further extension of food service to all schools by September. The city of Grand Rapids has extended food service from secondary schools and a few elementary schools to all poverty-area schools and is currently considering a program to extend service to all schools. The city of Kalamazoo has already extended food service from secondary schools to all of its schools, and the city of Benton Harbor is planning to extend food service to all of its buildings by fall. The cities of Lansing, Ann Arbor and others are indicating the conduct of at least pilot study programs during the coming fiscal year. These should be speeded up.

We know that progress is being made, BUT—we are the first to admit that the problem is not solved, nor is the story complete. We still have a long ways to go, and a short period of time in which to get there. More must be done and is in fact being planned.

II

We believe there are four or five basic problems currently being faced by the state educational agency, the school lunch administration, all Michigan public schools, and private schools as well from what I hear.

(a) The first of these involves general school financial problems. This is certainly not limited to the Detroits or the Podunk Centers but is universal, even to Grosse Pointes and the Birminghams. At the same time that many boards of education are faced with the possibility of canceling teachers' contracts, they must also determine whether picking up food service deficits are justifiable.

(b) The second problem is one of rising prices, increasing costs and the resultant financial crises to school lunch programs themselves. Many of our parent programs are at the point of saturation. We are proving statistically that every 5-cent raise in price over 30 cents at the elementary level brings out a corresponding 15 or 20 percent decrease in participation, and a wheel within a wheel develops. Higher costs, higher prices, lower participation create higher costs, higher prices, etc. etc. etc.

Increases in the number of free or reduced-price lunches served to needy children are really not a great problem due to federal reimbursements, and most school districts are not in any way attempting to curtail programs because of this.

(c) The third is a problem alluded to earlier—a general philosophical attitude of some school administrators and other educators that the school lunch program is, in fact, only a feeding program and that it actually is not a part of the educational program at all. We can finally see some breakthrough, and many school superintendents, business managers and boards of education are beginning to feel the priority which must be placed on child feeding in order to provide an educational program to every child according to his ability to learn. This change in attitude has certainly been enhanced by the adequate funding this year.

(d) The fourth problem, although I think the first three are enough to create nightmares for anyone, is the myriad regulations and paperwork being necessitated. We believe that the Congress did a tremendous job in the passage of Public Law 91–248. The law, itself, with one or two exceptions, is irreproachable and certainly provides us with the background and the avenues for solutions to the problem.

There is, no doubt, an honest attempt on the part of United States Department of Agriculture personnel to extend, encourage and otherwise increase free or reduced-price lunches to needy children, by regulation. Unfortunately, my experience has not proved such to be the result.

(e) The fifth problem, alluded to earlier in our statement about the hurry-up measures, is a problem of time. We do need time to get this problem completely solved. The implementation of lunch programs initially and the service of free and reduced-price lunches to needy children which goes with them doesn't just happen. Tremendous progress has been made just within the last two or three months. With continued adequate and extended funding and a little more time, we will complete it.

III

The third section of this testimony consists of some recommendations as to what might be done to solve these problems. Let's dispose of numbers 1, 3, 4, and 5 in rapid order, leaving number 2 for last.

The first can be solved "easily" by a revision of the tax structure in Michigan itself, to provide adequate funding for general school finance and thus take the heat off the school lunch program. Number three can and is being solved by a general improvement in philosophy to the effect that the school lunch program is not only a feeding program but must also be tied in to the regular educational program. Providing for minimum regulatory measures allowing for maximum hours spent feeding and educating children would solve number four; and providing a reasonable amount of time for all this to take place would really be an asset toward final goal accomplishment.

In contemplating number two—lunch program financing—let us dream a little first about some things in the future. There are those as well as myself, in food service, in other educational endeavors, and in the Congress who are talking seriously about a universally free lunch program, one that would feed all children at no charge regardless of their economic status. Such a program, while expensive, would solve three problems that appear to be almost unsolvable: (1) it would solve the anonymity factor for those children who are financially in need of free or reduced-price lunches under the present system; (2) a program entirely funded with tax dollars would also produce a payment system for each according to his ability to pay; and (3) it would automatically place the school lunch program as a part of the total educational effort.

One problem would be created—the necessity for increased financing. If 90 percent of our children eventually participated, costs would be close to $120 per child per year or about $175,000,000 in Michigan alone. What better way is there to spend tax dollars than in providing for hungry children?

Some say a bit more realistic course to follow might be the adoption of the recommendations made a few years ago by the State Directors at a national conference in Washington, D.C., and just brought out again by Dr. Porter in his testimony. This plan, based on a federal, state and local partnership, would provide lunches for all children based on a charge to the child not to exceed 25 cents. Free or further reduced-price lunches would continue to be provided to financially needy children. Tax costs for this program would be considerably less than those mentioned above, but less would be gained as a result.

What can be done within the terms of Public Act 91–248, looking practically toward 1971–72 and 1972–73? Michigan's federal allotment this year amounts to approximately $19,277,000 including special milk. There is an outside chance that we will not be in a position to use it all and some of our Section 11 funds may have to be held over to next year. This is true mainly for the reasons outlined above, but I believe that there are three others. The first was a regulation which involved the 12-cent reimbursement rule, which, I understand, is taken care of and will not present a problem next year. The second was fund availability—the Act was not passed until January, and even though we told our schools what would happen, most wanted to see the dollar signs prior to expanding services. The third is the lack of Section 4 funds. While the allotment was for considerably more than planned, more is needed to assist school districts in the continuation of the basic reason for a lunch program in the first place—that of a well-balanced, inexpensive lunch program for all children. Our basic rate this year averages 4½ cents. Without the parent program, no one participates or benefits, and without a substantial increase in Section 4 funds (cash for food) many programs are on the verge of folding up.

I have three suggestions, therefore, for funding in 1971–72 and 1972–73. One, that there be no relaxation of policy which would insist on the addition of state-appropriated funds.

Two, to eliminate most of the categorical aids provided by the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts and provide the states with general cash assistance. The states could then be held responsible under the law and minimum regulations for determining the use of funds including the reimbursement rates to be provided under each of the programs. An omnibus bill, based upon Public Law 91–248 would be the most appropriate, but I believe that such an idea can be worked out under the two current Acts. *If not*, more freedom should be provided the States in making necessary fund transfers within Public Law 91–248.

Third, expand the provision of funds under certain basic conditions for the *construction* of facilities, as well as for equipment. Include in this, provision for the procurement of mobile or temporary kitchens which might be moved from place to place as the situation called for. Current regulations provide for the equipping of such units, but not for the original purchase.

Based on a change in our reporting system, I have no real, solid estimate as to the amount of money necessary to carry out our programs for next year. Basically, however, let me try to estimate several needs:

1. We know that additional "cash for food" funds are necessary. Section 4 should therefore be doubled. The amount of $10,000,000 and the authority to establish minimum reimbursement rates—at least 7½ cents per lunch—will be needed in order to insure the continuance of many of our parent programs.
2. Section 11 funds and Section 32 funds need to be increased to approximately $17.5 million, where $8.5 million will probably be too much for this year. Based upon current (the last three months) increases, we will soon be serving 200,000 or more needy children daily.
3. Breakfast programs will double (at a minimum) and the rate must be increased from 15 cents to 20 cents. Needs will approach $750,000.
4. Nonfood, with the extension to cover construction or other building costs as well as equipment, would require about $3,000,000.
5. Being a great advocate of the National School Lunch Program which requires one-half pint of milk as a component, I would suggest that the $100,000,000 or so currently being funneled into milk consumption for children be switched to the National School Lunch Program. It makes no sense to me, and never has, that schools may be reimbursed 4 cents for a half pint of milk while at the same time and place only 4 cents can be provided for a complete lunch including a half pint of milk. This type of reimbursement procedure has, over a period of years, compounded many of our school lunch problems. I do not mean to intimate that milk is not nutritious. It is. But a half pint of milk is certainly not as nutritious as is a complete Type A lunch, or as is a complete breakfast—both of which include in their requirements the service of a half pint of milk.

May I repeat that the story is not complete—that many pages are yet to be written, but additional pages are being printed every day.

a. We are now reaching about 50 percent of all children attending those buildings where food service is available. This is increasing every day in spite of a few districts giving up entirely.

b. Best estimates are that there are about 197,000 needy children in buildings where food services currently are available. We are reaching about 120,000 or about 61 percent of them. Even though this percentage is increasing daily, we are currently trying to determine why we are not reaching 90 percent.

c. Average costs of lunch production in Michigan in 1969–70 were about 68 cents per lunch including United States Department of Agriculture commodity costs, or about 60.5 cents not including commodities. The average charge to the child was 40.8 cents per lunch, and the average reimbursement rate for the

same period was 6.4 cents. There is quite a gap. This substantiates our need for double Section 4 funds.

I have, in conclusion, one final plea for an *early* passage of an appropriations bill which will have in it funding sufficient to complete the job, remembering that in Michigan 1971–72 will no doubt be the most critical in our history in feeding and educating children. If funding is inadequate, programs will fold altogether—if funding is adequate as recommended here, programs will grow as we have never seen them grow before.

Thank you again for allowing me the privilege of meeting with this Committee once again. If I can be of any further assistance to the Committee or any of its members, I certainly hope you will not hesitate to ask. If there are any questions, I will be happy to do what I can to answer them.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BOROUGH. I will point out at the outset my testimony deals only with the statistical data gathered from the public schools. We have no authority in Michigan to administer the program for nonpublic schools and, as a consequence, all of these data must be gathered from some other source.

There are three basic sections of my testimony, one to provide some historical and accurate data, and the second to outline a few of the problems we are facing in Michigan, and we do have a few, and to make a few recommendations for solving them.

In my written testimony I went into the history of school lunch in Michigan to show some of the basic attitudes on the part of Michigan educators and even on the part of the Congress occasionally. I brought out as early as 1961 this office supported Senator Hart in several attempts to obtain funding to begin special programs to assist needy children under section 11 of the National School Lunch Act—unsucessfully, I might add.

I forgot to bring out some points, that the $4,025 that was mentioned by Mr. Houseman of a family of four was a family income guideline adopted by the State board of education, so these are mandatory for school use throughout the State, even though the Federal guidelines for the same family of four are $3,720.

We are, as Dr. Porter said, the first to admit that we do have a long way to go, that we are not getting the job done as it should be done.

In my written testimony I set up several examples of ways in which our people within the last 2 or 3 months are getting going. Let me provide you with another "for instance" that just came to my attention last Friday afternoon after the written testimony had been submitted.

I recall this in addition to the things that are happening in Detroit, Grand Rapids, and most of the other areas throughout the State, and it deals with the city of Kalamazoo public schools. My office has been working over a period of years attempting to change philosophical attitudes with the school district administration and in implementing the opening of elementary food service, particularly in the poverty area schools.

We were in on the decisionmaking in Kalamazoo last fall when they decided to move ahead as rapidly as possible following some of our recommendations. The following facts can be duplicated many times throughout our State and, as I said before, the growth that you see here is prevalent throughout the entire State.

Back in 1968–69, of the 39 schools in Kalamazoo, only 10 were participating in the national school lunch program and those were primary or secondary schools. They served an average daily participation that year of 3,140 and, believe it or not, they served the sum total of 90 of these a day free or reduced price to needy children. In 1969–70 not too much progress, although they had increased the service to one school and they had increased the number of free lunches to needy kids to 268. In December 1970, this past December, they now have 40 schools, 15 of them were in the program, an average daily participation of a little over 3,200, and 820 lunches were served daily to needy children free.

27 of 40 Schools Now in Program

I just happen to have the April statistical data, the card just came in about 15 minutes before I left Friday afternoon. They still have 40 schools, of these schools now 27 are in the program. They are serving an average daily participation of 4,080 a day, and of these 1,890 are served free to needy kids.

This is the type of thing that is beginning to take place all over the State. We know that progress is being made, but we are again the first to admit that the problem is not solved. We still have a long way to go and a short period of time to get there. More must be done and, in fact, is being planned.

May I bring out here that many groups, including the school groups, parent groups, and others, are cooperating with us to get the job done. Michigan in regional OEO offices and many of its branch agencies such as the CAP agencies and their workers and many, many others are really being most helpful in a number of our cooperative ventures.

We believe there are four or five basic problems currently being faced by this agency and the Michigan public schools and private schools as well, from what I hear. I will touch only two of those here.

The first involves a general school financial problem. This is certainly not limited to the Detroits or Podunk Centers but there is universal need for the lunch funds, even to the Grosse Pointes and the Birminghams. At the same time that many of our local boards of education are being faced with the possibility of canceling teachers' contracts, they are at the same time being asked to determine whether picking up food service deficits are justified.

A second problem is one of rising prices, increasing costs, and the resultant financial crises to school lunch programs themselves. Many of our parent programs are at the point of saturation. We are proving statistically that every 5-cent raise in price over 30 cents at the elementary level brings out a corresponding 15 or 20 percent reduction in participation, and a wheel within a wheel develops. Higher costs produce higher prices, higher prices produce lower participation, and lower participation creates higher costs and higher prices and so forth and so forth and so forth. Increases in the number of free or reduced price lunches served to needy children are really not a problem due to the Federal reimbursements, not a problem in this phase, and most school districts are not in any way attempting to curtail programs because of the free lunch policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The third section of the testimony consists of some recommendation as to what might be done to solve these problems. The first can be solved so easily by a general provision of the tax structure in Michigan itself to provide adequate funding for general and thus take the heat off the school program. In contemplating No. 2, however, I brought out in my written testimony some dreams of the universally free lunch and the problems that it would solve and coupled with the cost. I brought out the idea of a lunch funded cooperative with local, State, and Federal funds which would guarantee a lunch for children costing no more than 25 cents, and this was alluded to by Dr. Porter.

I made three suggestions for funding in 1971–72, under current conditions. First, that there be no relaxation of policy or law which would insist on the addition of State-appropriated funds.

Second, that categorically such aids as "as such" be eliminated, as such, and that the States be held accountable under the law for the distribution of funds and the reimbursement rates and so forth. Public Law 91–248 is tremendous and the Congress should truly be complimented on its passage and I believe such an idea can be worked out under it. If not, more freedom should be provided the States in making these fund transfers within Public Law 91–248.

Third, I recommend the expansion of the provision of funds under certain basic conditions for the construction or purchase of facilities as well as for equipment. Include in this provision for the procurement of mobile or temporary kitchens which might be moved from place to place as the situation is called for. Current regulations provide for the equipping of such units, but not for the original purchase.

PARTICULAR NEEDS CITED

I suggested that we have several leaders in the estimated funding to meet these needs:

(1) Cash for food or section 4 funds need doubling in order to assure continuation of the present program.

(2) Section 11 funds and section 32 funds need to be increased to \$17½ million where \$8½ million will probably be too much for this year because of the tardiness with which our schools are started. Based upon current, that is, the last 3 months' increases, we will soon be serving 200,000 or more needy children a day.

(3) Breakfast programs will no doubt double and the rate of reimbursement must be increased from 15 to 20 cents. Our needs will approach \$750,000 a year, in that category. Incidentally, we are out of breakfast program funds at the present time because of current increases in that particular part of our program.

(4) Nonfood, with the extension to cover construction or other building costs as well as equipment, would require approximately \$3

million. This is a rough guess based on the fact that we would use about $1,250,000 this year for equipment alone.

(5) I suggested that the special milk program funds be diverted to lunch and breakfast, which include one-half pint of milk in their requirements.

May I repeat that our story is not completed; that many pages are yet to be written, but additional pages are being written every day. We are now in April reaching about 50 percent of all children attending these buildings where food services are available, and this is increasing every day in spite of a few districts giving up entirely.

Best estimates are that we have about 197,000 needy children in buildings where food services currently are available. We are reaching just short of 120,000 of those, or about 61 percent. Even though this percentage is increasing daily, we are currently trying to determine why we are not reaching 90 percent. This summer we intend to do a staff study which will show us, we hope, more accurately the number of potentially free lunch customers and why we are missing some of them.

Average costs of lunch production in Michigan in 1969–70 were about 68 cents per lunch including the U.S. Department of Agriculture commodity costs of a little over 60.5 cents, not including the commodities. Our average reimbursement rate, including the funds that were provided for needy children, was about 6½ cents. There is quite a gap. This substantiates our need for additional section 4 funds.

I have in conclusion one final plea for an early passage of appropriations bill which will have in it funding sufficient to complete the job, and when remembering that, as far as I am concerned, in Michigan 1971–72 will no doubt be the most critical in our history in the feeding and education of children. If funding is inadequate, programs will die. If funding is adequate, as recommended here, programs will grow as we have never seen them grow before, and we will meet some of the deadlines and some of the goals that we have presented for ourselves.

Thank you again for allowing me the privilege of meeting with this committee once again. If I can answer any questions, I will be happy to do so.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Borough, you have been helpful to our office over long years. I know that your assurance of willingness to help the committee is sincerely voiced, I am sure.

Mr. **Borough**. Thank you.

State Has 300,000 Eligible Children

Senator **Hart**. In going over your prepared statement a disparity in figures is apparent and I think it would be well to clarify on the record how this occurs. There are about 300,000 eligible children in the State.

Mr. **Borough**. Roughly, yes.

Senator **Hart**. And in January you reported having reached 35 percent, and then in March of the total number of eligible children, this was reduced to about 215,000 and the report stated that 60 percent of those were being reached. What is the explanation?

Mr. BOROUGH. The difference, Senator, is that the 300,000 are, I believe this is true, the 300,000 would represent the total number of needy children within the State, whereas the 215,000 is a rough guess of the number of children currently attending buildings where there is food service available. The 215,000 also corresponds somewhat to the number of title I eligibles in the State.

Senator HART. That leaves us, I think, subject to the charge that we are really kidding ourselves if we use a formula that shows a substantial percentage being reached of what appear to be needy children but actually are just the number of needy children in schools that happen to have programs.

Mr. BOROUGH. That is true, but I was under the impression that someone in the U.S. Department of Agriculture office from the other States were reporting in that fashion and that is one of the reasons why I changed our report.

Senator HART. Whether or not the Department asks that kind of report, it would seem to me that filing it in that fashion tends to reduce public pressure to insure the needy children are being fed.

Mr. BOROUGH. Yes.

Senator HART. It would suggest that substantial inroads are being made, but if it is actually just the inroads being made in schools that happen to have programs and there are a lot of kids in schools without programs that don't show, those children are still needy, they are still eligible, they are still hungry, and they are still without a meal.

Mr. BOROUGH. Absolutely.

Senator HART. And it would seem to me to make good sense to require the reporting of the number of eligibles, the number of hungry, and then we can measure the extent to which we are responding.

REACHING ONLY ONE-THIRD OF ELIGIBLES

Mr. BOROUGH. This is why we have up to that time been using the 300,000 figure. We are reaching just a little over a third of them.

Senator HART. All right. Now, you commented that you haven't been able to spend all of the money that you received from the Department of Agriculture this year. Yet a number of States, and I know that California and New Mexico are among them, but I believe there were others, needed millions of dollars more than the Department of Agriculture originally granted them.

Our figures suggest that Illinois is reaching 90 percent of its eligibles by its own funding and Illinois still was able to spend not only the amount that the Department allocated, but, in fact, asked for and received an additional almost $3 million. Why are those States able to go through all that the Department allocates and get some more and we are not able to spend even our allocation?

Mr. BOROUGH. I seriously believe that this is a problem of our not being able to get our larger cities to move with this program until much later than some of the other States have. As I brought out in my testimony with Kalamazoo, most of these schools are at least moving right now and have committed themselves to getting the job done, and this is the reason why I say we will no doubt need considerably more funds next year because of the commitments that we have learned about from our local districts that will begin in the fall.

Why we weren't able to get them started is, I guess, up to them. We certainly informed them of the things that were available. We have found it most difficult, in spite of the fact, as you said a few minutes ago, in spite of the fact we tell these people we do have the money available. Some of our people are conservative enough and have financial problems enough to want to see the dollar signs, I guess, before they actually commit themselves to expanding their program.

Now, whether this is right or wrong, I am not saying. I am saying this is probably the fact of the case.

Senator **Hart**. Certainly I am not a person who feels that if Illinois is getting more defense contract money that Michigan should match or exceed that, but when Illinois gets more money to feed a higher percentage of its hungry children that Michigan does, I would say we are in second place. There are no alibis that are acceptable, in that kind of competition we should engage fully. I hope we can understand better why it is that in certain of these other States, they meet a much greater percentage, in the problem of feeding the eligible hungry child than do we in Michigan.

ILLINOIS STATE LAW REQUIRES FEEDING

Mr. **Borough**. Illinois is rather unique. They have a State law that requires a school district to feed needy children, no matter where they are located. I don't know what the penalty is, but the State law does provide every needy child shall be provided for, and they provide also State appropriations to help get the job done.

Senator **Hart**. Why do you think leadership in Illinois has been able to persuade its legislature to do that, apparently to make the people of Illinois undertand the almost overwhelming moral claim; they do it, and we run such a poor second?

Mr. **Borough**. I don't know. If I knew, we would probably have such a statute on our books, too. I really don't. We have tried.

Senator **Hart**. Well, I think this is a subject we can spend a lot of time attempting to get an answer to, and leave some of these other problems for later today until we get an answer to this one.

Mr. **Borough**. They tell me, though, that in Illinois the answer to the whole question was the commitment of Chicago and they ran out of Federal funds and when they ran out of Federal funds everybody screamed and yelled so loud the State legislature came through. This was a few years ago.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. **Cassidy**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to pursue the percentage of participation a little further. What percentage are the 300,000 eligible children you estimate to the total number of school children in the State?

Mr. Borough. There are roughly 2 million children attending schools and these are the figures which they gave me, our other departments gave me.

Mr. Cassidy. About 15 percent?

Mr. Borough. About 15 percent, yes.

Mr. Cassidy. Isn't that an unusually low percentage of needy children in comparison to the estimates of other States, especially industrial States such as Michigan?

Mr. Borough. I don't know.

Mr. Cassidy. I think it is; I think it is quite low. Wouldn't you think it is particularly an unusually low figure in view of the estimated figure in the National Nutrition Survey, there are about 25 percent of the children in Michigan, school-age children, suffering from nutritional problems, malnutrition, which is some indication of poverty?

Mr. Borough. In order to answer that, I would have to know where the study was taken, whether it was a rather detailed study in the city of Detroit or——

Mr. Cassidy. No; it was statewide.

Mr. Borough. Statewide. I am not aware of this study being made, but, if this is true, then we are low on our estimates.

Difference of 60,000 in Report

Mr. Cassidy. Getting back to the March 1971 report of eligibles reached, the original report to the Department was that 72,000; then we received a corrected version from your office of 139,000. How do you account for an error or a difference of some 60,000 in the report?

Mr. Borough. Let me answer that two ways. First, I am not responsible for filling out the reports any longer. This has been removed to our accounting section. I assume, however, that the difference would be in the fact that the first monthly claim or the first monthly report was based on only a partial month. In other words, it probably would run through on the first maybe 50 percent of the claims that went in that month, then corrected after the rest of the claims had been run.

Mr. Cassidy. Is that a frequent occurrence, an early report that needs to be corrected?

Mr. Borough. I would think so, yes.

Mr. Cassidy. Isn't that somewhat problematical in obtaining funds and so forth for the department?

Mr. Borough. It is difficult.

Mr. Cassidy. Isn't that something that should be corrected, then, to improve the State administration of the program?

Mr. Borough. I think it should, yes, and I am hedging because this is not my responsiblity to make those decisions. I can recommend. Someone else makes the decision where the accounting should be done or where the claims should be done.

Mr. Cassidy. On the average of Michigan schools, it appears only about 37 percent of the children in schools with a lunch program actually get lunches. Nationally that average runs about 56 percent.

Mr. Borough. I am told that the average daily attendance in those schools where lunch is being served is a little over 1,200,000.

Mr. Cassidy. Participation, I am sorry.

Mr. Borough. And the participation in those schools is about 619,000 or 618,000. This would be a little over half.

Mr. Cassidy. That is not the figure that is reported in the department records; it would be 37 percent.

Mr. Borough. Unfortunately, this is part of the problem that we talked about earlier.

Are Inaccurate Reports Hindering Program?

Senator Hart. That seems like a very serious problem. If we can't get an accurate picture of what Michigan's figures are, it seems to me that is a problem that is standing in the way of the program in any way implementing Congress' intent to reach all children. I mean, if we can't say how many people are in the program accurately, it is very difficult to appropriate the money for Congress to act.

I don't think in the dozen or so hearings we have had we have had a situation where a State couldn't report accurately who was participating or not participating, what the numbers were.

Mr. Borough. I don't mean to intimate that the reports aren't accurate, they are probably accurate as far as they have gone, but they are incomplete.

Mr. Cassidy. That is somewhat a nebulous difference, isn't it, incomplete or inaccurate?

Mr. Borough. Yes.

Mr. Cassidy. Effectuated the same?

Mr. Borough. Right. Now, in our estimates, our office has used a card from which we have asked some of our school districts to use to report to us, and in our estimates we have used these figures. They are not official at all now, but they certainly give us a little better idea of what we have going and what we need to have going. This is the reason why I say it appears that we are not going to be able to use all of our funds this year, and I am not really too sure of that.

Mr. Cassidy. Since you were out of breakfast money, have you asked for more breakfast program funds and requirements?

Mr. Borough. Yes.

Mr. Cassidy. And what response did you receive?

Mr. Borough. They tell me that additional breakfast funds are being made available. In the meantime we are using section 32 to get the claims paid.

Mr. Cassidy. Your first recommendation calls for revision of Michigan's tax structure, specifically in regard to the school lunch program. Do you believe it would be easier to revise the tax structure or amend the School Lunch Act?

Mr. Borough. No; I think you misunderstood. What I meant there was there are a number of people, including myself, who think that the tax structure in Michigan needs to be revised as far as general school finances are concerned, not necessarily the lunch program. But, if this were true, if this should happen, then our school lunch program would necessarily benefit because the schools would no longer have the pressure applied to them of having poor financing in their regular general fund operation.

Mr. CASSIDY. How does your 68-cent lunch cost break down in terms of food, labor, and so forth?

Mr. BOROUGH. I don't have that data with me.

Mr. CASSIDY. Would you supply those to the committee for the record?*

Mr. BOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. CASSIDY. Thank you.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. Borough, in your testimony or in earlier testimony it was stated that States were to supply or come up with a proposal of programs to implement school lunch programs throughout the school districts, public school districts. Can you give us an idea of what your approach is, how you go into a State that has no school lunch program? What is your approach, with whom do you start, what is the machinery that you try to get started to get a school lunch program going?

Mr. BOROUGH. First of all, we have, on the basis of the latest count, 622 school districts, I believe, in the State of Michigan, and the national school lunch program is operated in 543 of these. The ones that are left are mainly small school districts or large school districts that are operating school lunch programs with or without Federal assistance. So we do operate in a majority of our school districts, and that has not necessarily been the big problem.

LARGE CITIES MAIN PROBLEM AREAS

The big problem has been in the Detroits and Grand Rapids and in the Flints and some of these, in order to get them to provide lunches at the elementary level where they had been previously only at the secondary.

As I said before, we have been making some progress, not this or my office, but with the help of a lot of other people. We have been making some progress in getting through to the administrators and the boards of education and in a great many of our larger schools so that we do have commitments from them, either they are in the poverty areas of schools now or they will be in them in the fall. Our approach has not necessarily been to crack their knuckles for what they are not doing, but rather to try to get through to them on a philosophical change so they really want to make the change, without trying to intimidate tham at all with any penalties.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. BECKHAM. Yes.

Senator HART. What penalties, if any, could be applied?

Mr. BOROUGH. I don't know.

Senator HART. I am not aware of any.

Mr. BOROUGH. No. But we certainly didn't take the threatening attitude. What we try to do is take the positive attitude. This is what we can do to help you do this if you will go, rather than the negative approach in atttempting to get through what we will do to them if they don't.

Is that what you meant?

---

*See Appendix 1, pp. 1494, 1495.

Mr. Beckham. I think that gives me an idea of the problem.

Mr. Borough. Yes. We have been working with committees at the local level, committees of parents. We have been working with boards of education. We have been working with school administrators, anybody we can work with.

Mr. Beckham. Specifically Lansing, for instance, the elementary school program there is getting a school lunch in?

Mr. Borough. We worked with the school administration and the school lunch——

Mr. Beckham. But it is a long process, is that right?

Mr. Borough. Yes, it is.

Senator Hart. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. Kinney. Along those same lines, it is a very well-known fact, and this case has been pointed out here in the hearings, you have some very difficult problems in attracting the State legislature to give moneys to the school lunch programs, sort of similar to the prison problems across the country. I don't see how we can get those two together. This seems to be a worthwhile program in the best interests of some of the legislatures, too.

You pointed out here on page 9 of your statement:

> (2) to eliminate most of the categorical aides provided by the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts and provide the States with general cash assistance.

I take it you would like to have the moneys and have the opportunity to cooperate on some controls on where the money should be spent and allow you the opportunity to transfer funds from one source to another?

Mr. Borough. Yes.

Mr. Kinney. Along these lines, would you favor an affirmative action program on the part of the States to implement certain kinds of food programs? It has been pointed out here we have no way to tax or to punish those school districts that won't provide the services. Would you be in favor of withdrawing Federal funds or giving it to a private contractor to do the job?

PREROGATIVE OF LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. Borough. The lunch program operation in the State of Michigan has historically been the prerogative of the local school districts. I would hate to see this upset, and I would certainly impose penalties only as a last resort if there were such a way to do it.

For example, all we do if we withdraw Federal funds, as I see it at least, is defeat some of the purposes we are trying to work for. We are in any city, for example, if they are already providing 500 lunches daily to needy children, we can't very well justify pulling funds out of that program. At least it doesn't make sense to me that we can, because they are not reaching 300 more, because all we have done in this instance is withdraw services from some of the children who needed it, and I think we have put ourselves in rather a vulnerable position if we were to do this.

I don't know what the answer is, really, but I think we would have to look at it very carefully if we did something like this.

Mr. Kinney. Let me clear the water here a little bit. I would be willing to agree that to withdraw Federal funds would still cause those children who grow up who are not receiving lunches to suffer. But would you favor withdrawing Federal funds so that State legislatures tend to be more meaningful, more interested in receiving, for instance, in some other area, public works or some other area, to force them to come up with the school lunch moneys?

Mr. Borough. I think I would rather, of course, here, again, we have a time element, I think I would rather do it positively if it is at all possible.

Favors Universally Free Lunch

Mr. Kinney. According to your previous statement, you tried certain methods of going in, working with committees and going into communities and trying to come up with some programs so these children can have an opportunity to learn as they suffer from malnutrition and what-have you. You have pointed out the State legislature won't come up with the money and the Chairman has made it clear we need to find out how we do that at some of these hearings. I am trying to open some avenues of thought for those who might come after you in the hearing.

You also favor a national school lunch program?

Mr. Borough. Yes. This is the one we are talking about.

Mr. Kinney. Right. I mean where all children receive school lunches regardless of their level of income or economic condition?

Mr. Borough. A universally free lunch?

Mr. Kinney. Yes.

Mr. Borough. Right.

Mr. Kinney. And would you favor tax increases to pay for this program?

Mr. Borough. Yes, sir.

Mr. Kinney. OK. Along those same lines now, we have talked about the quality of food and I was thinking in those conversations we were more concerned about the inability to get some children to go to the lunch counter and get food as opposed to going across the street and getting pop or soda water, whatever you want to call it. There have been cases where the instructors had to stand by the machines or had to close down the various machines in the school in order to attract them to the lunch program.

Let me ask you this now. In your experiences, what has been done in the educational area of nutrition that would teach that kid the need for adequate diet?

Mr. Borough. We have been so busy doing the things that Mr. Houseman mentioned in getting our priority, our own staff priorities established, and we have been so busy just trying to get food programs initiated that we haven't been doing too much on the area that you are bringing out. This summer I hope that a part of our staff study that I mentioned in my testimony will cover some of the reasons that you are mentioning here. That is, we know that quality of food has a great deal to do with children participating in the program, there is no question about that; just how much I don't know. But I think our first effort has to be in getting the school lunch programs into these buildings in the first place. Then we can worry about correcting some of the other deficiences, if there are any, at a later date. Again, there is no doubt that a hot lunch program is more preferable than a cold lunch, even though both might meet the requirements. One seems to be a little more acceptable than the other.

Mr. **Kinney.** I can see your point, I can appreciate it. It has been pointed out before. If we are going to do anything about the problem, if the food can be available, if a kid or parent can't recognize the need for that particular diet we have done very little in providing that particular service to the child. So what I was trying to point out here, I know this isn't one of your responsibilities, at some point in time we are going to have to make sure in a particular package the educational opportunity be provided for a particular child so he can appreciate an adequate diet.

NUTRITION EDUCATION NEEDED

Mr. **Borough.** Our department of education and one of my staff members is cooperating on this committee endeavor. I don't know how far along we are in this because I haven't received a final report yet, but it is my understanding that, through the members of our department and the health department, I can't remember, there are a couple of other agencies involved. Michigan State University is involved and I think one of the other universities in this State is involved now in trying to determine some kind of a nutrition education program that not only will reach teachers with the nutrition education but also will get to the children.

You are right, you can serve the best meal in the world but, if the kid doesn't eat it, it doesn't do him any good.

Mr. **Kinney.** One other point and I will turn it over to the chairman.

Are you contracting with any private firm to render food service to the schools?

Mr. **Borough.** I don't personally. The State department doesn't have that responsibility, but we do have three or four contracts, food management contractors, who are operating in the State in, I think, about eight school districts.

Mr. **Kinney.** How does the cost of that school program compare with the 68 cents per lunch?

Mr. **Borough.** It is more expensive. I am not saying it is more expensive than the 68 cents, but, by and large, it is a more expensive program than a school-operated program.

Mr. **Kinney.** Does it cost the child the same amount of money, do you subsidize it or what?

Mr. **Borough.** I would have to look up those statistics. I don't know.

Senator **Hart.** I think it would be helpful for the record to provide the figures.

Mr. **Borough.** This would vary, too, from the different sections of the State.

49

How Do You Monitor Districts?

Mr. Cassidy. Mr. Borough, what methods do you use to monitor local school districts to determine whether they are complying with the regulations of the National School Act?

Mr. Borough. Over a period of years we have relied quite heavily on the intermediate school district superintendents' offices, and there are 59 of those, to do our program, what we call our program evaluation phase of our program, and this would be where the intermediate school district office, either the superintendent himself or his representative, would go into a school and gather the information; depending on their capabilities they might make some kind of a judgment on it and then send it to our office for professional judgment.

Mr. Kinney. That has been representatives of the school district evaluating schools in the district?

Mr. Borough. No. The intermediate school district office is a separate entity.

Mr. Kinney. That is part of your office?

Mr. Borough. It is not specifically, but it has been classed as more or less an arm of the State department. It is a coordinating or a coordinating agency, and I understand you have two or three consultants from the intermediate school district offices who will be testifying.

Mr. Kinney. Who are they, are they responsible to you?

Mr. Borough. Yes. They are responsible——

Mr. Kinney. For State employees?

Mr. Borough. No.

Mr. Kinney. They are local employees?

Mr. Borough. No; they are intermediate school district office employees. We have three systems, we have three units involved. The State department of education, the intermediate school district office, and there are 59 of them, and it is their responsibility not only in school lunch but in several other areas like special education and school transportation and this kind of thing, they coordinate or maybe the 25 or half a doxen, how many of them there are, local school districts within their jurisdiction. In that way they transmit information from the local units to us.

Mr. Kinney. But it is not a State evaluation, then; it is an intermediate school district evaluation, is that right?

Mr. Borough. It has been accepted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as meeting the requirements, yes.

Mr. Beckham. If I might, it is a little hard to understand.

The State department of education is a level of education over an intermediate and over a local school district. There are thus three levels. So he is a State employee but only by nature of the State school system, the board of education is financed solely through State appropriation. The local school district finances itself; the intermediate finances itself; the State school system gets its money from the State but still is part of the public school system.

Mr. Borough. They are kind of a quasi-arm of the school district, really.

State Office Has the Responsibility

Mr. Cassidy. But my point was that the State office itself has the responsibility under Public Law 91–248 of the regulations to evaluate the programs, and I was interested in whether that was, in fact, the State evaluation.

How many people of your staff participate in reviewing the evaluation that you receive?

Mr. Borough. Four.

Mr. Cassidy. Four?

Mr. Borough. Four professional consultants; that is it.

Mr. Cassidy. How much time do they spend in doing this?

Mr. Borough. Normally or now?

Mr. Cassidy. Give me both.

Mr. Borough. I say that a little bit facetiously because the U.S. Department of Agriculture analyses that are going on and the Federal auditors so that most of us have been pretty much tied to doing their bidding at the moment. But normally out of our State office, I think the figure is 243 reviews we have done this past year.

Mr. Cassidy. What kind of a percentage of your time would that employ?

Mr. Borough. Oh, I don't know, I would have to go back and draw up the percentages. Most of our time is expended making some kind of professional judgment about our program in one way or the other. This is our job.

Mr. Cassidy. Thank you.

Senator Hart. As you can see, we are searching, among other things, for a method to permit us someday to say there is no child in this or any other State who goes without nourishment, and if we become convinced that the school lunch and school breakfast programs are the best way to insure the achievement of that goal, the only way to insure the achievement of the goal, then I would be willing to make the argument that shutting off the money, though it punishes the children who in a system are getting it, might very well be justified.

We had the same hang-up in years past over the so-called Powell amendment. Education was the means of opening opportunity and eliminating misunderstanding and prejudice, so don't close the schools, don't shut off the money. There was honest difference of opinion as to which was the prudent course on that and there are differences of opinion on how you attempt to persuade school districts to feed children. But I think it was you or an earlier witness who said that I guess it was Mayor Daley who compelled the Illinois Legislature and the Governor of Illinois to come up with money by simply running through all the money he had for a year in a 4-month period and then blew the whistle.

Before we get to that point, we have to convince ourselves that the system under which we are working, the school lunch program, is, indeed, the vehicle that can achieve this. Once we do that, I think the fair one is whether or not we ought to use very direct methods to compel them.

Mr. BOROUGH. As you know, I am one of those people who has been talking loud and long. This is, if not the only, the most logical method of insuring the fact that a child at least gets one meal a day. There are others who disagree, I am sure.

Senator HART. Thank you very much.

Mr. BOROUGH. Thank you for asking.

Senator HART. Now, from Grand Rapids, Mrs. Richard Parsaca. Mrs. Parsaca is the chairman of the school lunch committee of Kent County.

STATEMENT OF MRS. RICHARD PARSACA, CHAIRMAN, SCHOOL LUNCH COMMITTEE OF KENT COUNTY; ACCOMPANIED BY MR. BOB DI MATTIA, VISTA

Mrs. PARSACA. Thank you.

As you say, Senator Hart, I am Mrs. Richard Parsaca. I am chairman of the school lunch committee of Kent County, Mich.

Before I begin this testimony, I would like to say the major part of this statement was prepared for us by Bob DiMattia. He is a VISTA worker and a member of the committee. His deep insight into the school lunch problem in our area and his ability to get the information and to assess it properly have been great assets to our group.

Senator HART. Is Mr. DiMattia here?

Mrs. PARSACA. Yes; he is.

Senator HART. We would be glad to have him join us.

Mrs. PARSACA. Bob, would you come up here.

President Nixon stated at the White House Conference on Hunger:

> A child ill fed is dulled in curiosity, lower in stamina, distracted from learning. The cost of medical care for diet-related illness; remedial education required to overcome diet-related slowness in school; institutionalization and loss of full productive potential; all of these place a heavy economic burden on society as a whole.

Our committee was born in the summer of 1969, at an advisory council meeting of the West Side Complex, which is run by the community action program. The council became interested in school lunches when a public health nurse spoke to the council about the hungry schoolchild. When the council learned that four local ministers were feeding hungry poor children free hot lunches at their churches, and witnessed many schoolchildren roaming the streets at noontime with no lunch and no place to go, it recognized the relationship between hunger and the inability to learn, and decided that the responsibility for remedying the situation lay with the Grand Rapids Board of Education. With the help of Mr. Thomas Mathieu, the director of the West Side Complex, and his entire staff, we began a long battle for school lunches, a battle that lasted 22 months.

CONSERVATIVE TRADITIONS DELAY PROGRAM

The Grand Rapids Board of Education was and is, by and large, a conservative one, having for a long time stood by a tradition of favoring neighborhood schools so that children could eat lunch at home. Yet the board has a busing policy that now transports many children out of their neighborhoods for a so-called better education. In some elementary schools, boundary lines have been expanded so that in some cases a child has to walk over a mile one way to school. As we all know, Michigan winters are anything but mild. The board also stood by the belief that lunches were the responsibility of the parents, not the schools.

The committee set up a meeting with school officials to discuss the establishment of a school lunch program in the elementary schools. At this meeting the superintendent, Dr. Norman P. Wienheimer, tossed the whole issue of lunches back into the hands of the committee, and said that it had to deal with problems such as money, traditional board policy, lack of adequate food preparation and eating space, and lunchroom supervision.

The committee fell victim to this ploy and diverted its energy toward finding volunteer supervisors, which the superintendent later said were not acceptable, after we had collected more than 500 willing volunteers.

The next move of the board was to destroy the committee by showing that a lunch program in the 16 poverty-area elementary schools was not financially feasible. The committee made a good attempt at combating their figures but did not have the expertise to really deal with the board and could not possibly have done enough research in terms of what the board's cost would be in light of the Federal subsidies it would receive.

DEALING WITH GROUP OPPOSITION

The committee next tried to deal with group opposition to a lunch program from principals, PTA's, and teachers. One principal thought such a lunch program might lean toward "that in Communist countries where institutions play a large part in bringing up a child." The teachers' union, fearing that the teachers would lose their duty-free lunch hour, called it Excedrin headache No. 1. The crux of the opposition, which was prevalent among many of the nonpoor, was that the schools should not assume the responsibility for "negligent" parents. Along with this was a definite antiwelfare sentiment among the general public and among some school board members. The committee's responses fell on deaf ears.

Around this time the committee received a boost from the White House Conferences on Hunger, which set its sights on expanding the national school lunch program by recommending increased Federal appropriations for the program.

The board then decided to dangle a carrot in front of the committee. The board decided to ask for one additional mill in the upcoming millage election, $100,000 of which would be spent to set up a pilot school lunch program. The committee was very cautious about this offer because it felt that the board was putting the lunch program on the ballot and would not set one up if the millage didn't pass. The board had put the committee in a real bind. There was strong antiboard and antimillage feeling, especially in the black community. If we campaigned for the millage, it would alienate much of the community and possibly gain the lunch program. On the other hand, if we campaigned against the millage, we would be working against our goal and would probably lose the lunch program. It was a gamble and we lost.

While we did not really actively campaign for it, the public commitment was there. When the millage was defeated by a wide margin, Dr. C. Robert Muth, business manager for the board, blamed the committee, saying that the people rejected the millage because of the lunch program. The board later called another millage election, this time asking for no additional mill, and they won.

LEGAL AID SOCIETY INSTITUTES SUIT

Needless to say, at this point things reached an impasse, and little was said about school lunches for 5 or 6 months, until late summer of 1970. At this time, the school lunch committee convinced the Legal Aid Society to begin work on a class action suit on behalf of 10 welfare recipients with children in elementary schools, against the board, for failure to comply with Congress' mandate that local school districts set up school lunch programs with the needy children getting first priority.

While the suit was being prepared, the committee turned its attention to the lunch program which the board has been operating for some time in the junior and senior high schools. The committee discovered that there was a free lunch program but that it was not being used to its fullest potential mainly because very few people knew about it. Any student whose family was receiving public assistance was eligible for a free lunch. The committee also uncovered many cases of discrimination in the program, for example, students who were receiving free lunches were required to work for them. This was to build character, we were told. Free lunch recipients used different colored meal tickets. In some cases the child would have to say his name out loud to the lunchrooms cashier. When a parent went to school to apply for a free lunch, he was told in some cases that the school did not give away any free lunches, while being made to feel like a beggar just because he even had the nerve to come in and ask.

When a member of the committee went with that same parent, the parent was given an application blank to fill out. Even the board's application for a free lunch was found to be illegal because it had a work requirement stated on it and the parent had to agree to it before his child could get a free lunch.

The committee attempted to correct these inequities by launching a campaign to inform welfare recipients of their child's right to a free lunch and of his other rights within the program. Such a publicity campaign is required of the school board by law, but they refused to do it. The committee, with the help of Legal Aid, drew up its own legal application form which explained the recipient's rights. Committee members personally helped register about 100 students for free lunches and we have no account of the number of parents we urged to come in and register their own child.

Breakthrough in 1970

In the fall of 1970 the picture began to slowly change. The old superintendent left and Dr. C. Robert Muth, the business manager for the board, took over as acting superintendent. Legal Aid, after some prodding by the committee, issued an ultimatum to the board and the acting superintendent, and threatened them with a lawsuit that would have asked for an injunction halting all Federal school lunch money from entering Grand Rapids until the suit was decided. It was also at this time that we wrote to you, Senator Hart, and outlined the problem here and asked if you could some to Grand Rapids and meet with us. Your staff contacted me and a meeting was set up. We arranged a tour of the four churches that were feeding children free lunches.

At this time a new superintendent was appointed by the board, Mr. Phillip Runkel. Faced with a possible lawsuit, loss of current funding, and concerned about the board's public image with a millage election close at hand, he urged the board to adopt a school lunch program.

Although this was a major breakthrough for the committee, it was not entirely satisfied. The board issued its school lunch policy statement which established two sets of income guidelines—one to determine eligibility for free lunches, the other to determine eligibility for reduced price lunches. Most welfare recipients would have qualified under the free lunch scale, but the board explicitly stated that children from welfare families would qualify only for reduced price lunches costing 15 cents. This discriminated on the basis of source of income.

The committee went to work on this item, but the food service director of the State board of education, Mr. Borough, which has to approve all schoool lunch policies, stepped in and rejected the plan because of the discriminatory clause in it.

The board did remove the clause, but, at the same time, it slashed $600 off each level of the free scale so as to eliminate welfare recipients from the free category and put them into the reduced price one. The vote was split 5 to 4, with the five justifying it for economic reasons, fearing that they might not have enough money to cope with the rise in the number of free lunches. The board had previously voted to limit the number of free lunches to 4 percent of the total or 168 free lunches out of 4,200 eligible children. Some board members still felt strongly that the school should be in the teaching business, not in the food business.

The committtee has been wrestling with this problem of limited free lunches along with additional ones such as the quality of food, quantity, an illegal application form which clearly states that free lunches will not begin until the application is approved, appeal procedures for those denied free or reduced price lunches, and other irregularities for those denied free or reduced price lunches, and other irregularities in individual schools since the program got under way in February of this year. This was 22 months after the committee had asked the board why there was no lunch program in our elementary schools.

SYSTEM DISCRIMINATES AGAINST POOR

In a move probably designed to pacify the committee and its supporters, the superintendent recently announced the acquisition of new Federal money which has enabled him to increase the number of free lunches substantially by eliminating the original free scale and adopting the reduced price scale as the free one. This development makes most welfare recipients eligible for free lunches, but now no reduced price lunches are available. This means that if a child does not qualify for a free lunch, he has to pay the full price, 35 cents, on the elementary level and 40 cents on the secondary level. Such a system discriminates against the working poor. It also fosters resentment against the program in an antiwelfare community like Grand Rapids.

The committee is concerned about the other communities around the State which do not have school lunch programs that reach the needy child. At least 200,000 Michigan schoolchildren who would qualify for a free or reduced price lunch have no program available to them. To dramatize this unfulfilled need for more school lunch programs throughout the state and to try to rectify the situation, the committee called a statewide meeting for all those interested in eliminating hunger in Michigan schools. This meeting coincided with the annual State convention of the Michigan School Food Service Association. It was held in Grand Rapids, Mich.

The purposes of the workshop were to share ideas and to work with three experts. One was Mr. Hulbert James, director for the Crusade Against Hunger for the National Council of Churches; Miss Barabara Bode, program director for Children's Foundation; and Mr. Richard Beachnau from the Michigan Catholic Conference, whose job it was to show us how to get two vital pieces of school lunch legislation under consideration in the Michigan legislature passed. These are House Bill 4103 and House Bill 4106, both of which would provide additional funds to local school districts to expand existing school lunch programs, especially free and reduced price ones.

At the end of the day, we planned a peaceful demonstration of concern at the civic adutiorium where the food service people were having their banquet. However, as you see by the flyer I have given you, we made it clear that this was not part of the workshop and no one who attended the workshop was required to demonstrate.

DEMONSTRATION PLANS BRING REACTION

Shortly after these flyers went out on a State level, Mr. James Borough, food service director for the State of Michigan, called me. He was very concerned about the demonstration. He asked me not to have the demonstration. He clearly stressed that we would be demonstrating against the wrong people. He stated these people wanted to feed hungry children but they were prevented from doing so by the administrations they worked for.

I pointed out that these same people could make their voice heard and their administrations would listen. I also stated that a peaceful demonstration of concern for hungry children might give them some very positive thoughts to carry back home with them.

May I call your attention to two letters, one to Dr. Porter and the other to Mrs. Geraldine Dickason, in which I had requested a few minutes on the agenda of the banquet to stress some ideas. Only Dr. Porter answered; he said "No."

In my conversation with Mr. Borough, I again asked to be put on the agenda and was told no. I was then reminded that I could do much harm to lunch programs all over the State by this act, especially to those programs that are supposed to start in September. He reminded me that if I made those people angry, then perhaps there would not be any new lunch programs in September in some of the schools.

The next day I received a phone call from a person at the CAP office in Chicago. I was praised first for doing a good job, then told that a demonstration against food service people was not a wise move. I was asked not to demonstrate. The committee had sent the same flyer to all CAP people in the State as well as to some in Chicago. I was told that CAP people would be discouraged from attending the workshop because of the demonstration. I pointed out that it was not part of the workshop, and I stressed that they make every effort to have people attend.

Within a few minutes of this phone call I received another call from the Department of Agriculture in Washington. When this man identified himself as Mr. Rorex, I was really frightened. He said he was aware of the fine progress we had made in Grand Rapids, and also on the State level on the school lunch issue. He gently urged me to give second thoughts to the demonstration, saying that it would do more harm than good here in Michigan. After I told him we would not give up the demonstration, he thanked me, wished me good luck, and said goodbye.

We had a successful workshop and an almost peaceful demonstration. At the civic auditorium where the Food Service Association was meeting we found every door, except one, locked and chained, as well as members of the Grand Rapids Police Department's Special Alert Squad inside the auditorium. Food service members had to show special passes to get in. When we tried to enter through the open door, some of us were shoved down the steps and pushed against a wall. When we asked to speak with convention officials, we were told they had nothing to say to us. Then we left peacefully.

ASSESSMENT OF SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Now I would like to present to you our assessment of the school lunch situation in Grand Rapids:

1. The quality of the food in secondary, and especially in elementary schools, is poor. We have received numerous complaints from parents, students, and even teachers about the school lunch program. Many times lunches are not fresh, smell badly, or are not properly heated. These problems are especially prevalent in the elementary schools which are serviced by a private catering firm. The catered lunch is actually a hot sandwich program instead of a hot meal one.

We do not feel that this is the type of program that Congress had in mind when it established the school lunch program. These problems, of course, do not make the program appealing to many parents and students. This is reflected in the low participation rates which we have experienced in the first few months of operation.

2. Another major problem that we have encountered is the quantity of food being served. Many children remain hungry after eating their lunch. Children receiving a free lunch must pay for seconds while, in many cases, extra food is thrown away. When I asked the Grand Rapids Food Service Director, Mr. Lancashire, why this food is not given to still hungry children, he said that he could not set a precedent in our school system. This problem of quantity similarly hampers participation in the program. Low participation can, of course, be used by opponents of the school lunch program to discredit its popularity and necessity.

3. Still another problem is the kind of food being served. Many lunches simply do not appeal to the tastes of the children. We feel that children's special likes and dislikes should be considered by school lunch officials. This problem, too, can hinder participation in the program.

4. We have no uniform school lunch standards that must be followed by all principals. The school lunch policy was sent to all schools but its interpretation is left up to the principals. This is often confusing and in some cases hampers greatly the effort to reach the hungry child. We strongly feel that the feeding of hungry children should not be left to the discretion of principals, some of whom are opposed to the concept of the school lunch program.

5. In Grand Rapids the application form for free and reduced price lunches was sent home with the child. We feel that this form should have been mailed to the parents to insure its delivery. As you know, children, especially young ones, are many times not the best messengers.

When letters were sent to parents in February 1971, to inform them of the lunch program, there was no other notice of the guidelines for free or reduced price eligibility. There were none in the newspapers or on TV, although we repeatedly asked for them. When the guidelines were changed, making a free lunch available to those who had been eligible for a reduced price one, just the opposite occurred. No notice was sent home to parents, but the news media carried the guidelines. At no time were any notices made in Spanish, despite the fact that there is a large Spanish-speaking population in Grand Rapids.

6. We have also encountered in Grand Rapids no established procedure to deal with appeals for those whose applications for free lunches are denied. We feel that every parent whose child is denied a free lunch should automatically receive an appeal form along with an explanation of his rights.

MICHIGAN PROBLEMS SEEM TYPICAL

We have attempted here to relate some of the problems we have encountered in Grand Rapids. Based on contact with other concerned community groups and individuals in Michigan and throughout the country, we feel confident in saying that these problems are typical of those in other communities throughout the State and the Nation.

On the State level, we see several glaring problems facing school lunch advocates. We have found in many communities throughout Michigan that various procedures regarding school lunches violate the Federal laws. These violations, in many cases are pointed out by concerned community groups. The real responsibility for policing and correcting violations in local communities should lie first with the local school board, then with the State food service director, and finally with the Department of Agriculture. Apparently Mr. Borough does not have the staff to do this job, but we feel he should.

When community people start to investigate their local systems, it is most difficult to obtain public information from the State food service director, Mr. Borough. We have attempted on many occasions to obtain information with much stalling on the part of the food service department. We submit as evidence a letter written to Mr. Borough dated January 18, 1971. His reply to this letter is dated April 2, 1971. Please note that my questions were not answered. We have asked repeatedly for claim reimbursement forms and have not received them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We have some recommendations concerning the National School Lunch Act:

1. Stricter enforcement of existing school lunch laws.

2. We strongly urge that the income guidelines be raised to the National Welfare Rights Organization's free lunch standards, already implemented in some school districts as national policy. This standard is based on the National Bureau of Statistics and is much more realistic than the Department of Agriculture's standards.

3. The law should require:

(*a*) That school officials must notify parents of the school lunch program rules by mailing notices to the parents;

(*b*) In areas with high concentrations of non-English-speaking people, notices must be translated into their native language.

4. The Federal law should require school districts around the country to use standard forms, applications and appeal forms, drawn up at the Federal level. This would establish the kind of uniformity that will ensure equal and fair treatment and will protect the rights of all children.

5. The Federal regulations should urge wherever possible that school lunches be composed of the kinds of foods that appeal to the children, while at the same time meeting the nutritional requirements of the law. The program is of no value if children won't eat the lunch provided.

6. The School Lunch Act should require all needy school children must receive a free school lunch. Many times a child cannot take advantage of a school lunch program simply because his parents cannot afford the reduced price rate.

7. The Federal law should require, wherever possible, that school lunches be prepared within each school. If this is not possible, we

recommend that second priority be given to a satellite feeding program under which school buildings with kitchen facilities prepare and cook the food, which is then taken to schools by trucks which have hot trays in them. We make these two feeding recommendations because we feel that they would insure fresh and diverse hot meals.

8. The Federal law should require an increased quantity of food than it presently does. Growing children, especially poor ones, need more and better food than is currently required by law. This is important, given the fact that for many children a school lunch is their only well-balanced daily meal.

We recommend that the standard "type A" lunch be increased.

(*a*) From one-half pint of milk to 1 pint of milk, if the child desires it;

(*b*) From 2 ounces of protein such as lean meat, poultry, fish, et cetera, to 3 ounces of protein;

(*c*) From three-fourths of a cup of two or more vegetables or fruits or both, one-third may come from juice to one-half cup of fruit and one-half cup of vegetables;

(*d*) From a slice of bread or cornbread or a roll or muffin made of whole grain or enriched flour to two of any of these;

(*e*) From a teaspoon of butter or fortified margarine to two teaspoons of butter, et cetera.

While we support the concept of the school lunch program and have struggled for almost 2 years to make it a reality for the poor children in our community, we feel that the real answer to the problems of the poor in this country lies with a guaranteed adequate income based on the National Welfare Rights Organization's income standards. We urge you and the rest of the Congress to face this reality and to act accordingly.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak to you about the problems facing the hungry schoolchild in Michigan. Perhaps we are now closer to making the hungry schoolchild our number 1 priority.

Senator HART. Thank you very much.

We want to thank Mr. DiMattia as well.

Many of us are aware, Mrs. Parsaca, of your long efforts to assure that poor children in the Grand Rapids area do obtain a decent meal, and I welcome the chance again to thank you.

Thank you first for them.

I remember very clearly our visit to the four churches, and, when you see a group of kids being fed as those were, you wish that it was as newsworthy as seeing the same number of kids tearing up the block; the trouble is it isn't. But the truth is that if every home in this country would see the faces of the children, have some opinion as to the kind of family economy out of which they came, the fact they are white and black, some healthy and some sick, and all helpless, I think that our consciences would be reached. When they are reached, people like you two will have contributed enormously to it.

I know that the staff has a number of questions they want to ask you.

I just want to respond to the last point you make, after citing the shortcomings, after commenting on and commending a number of efforts toward improvement that you have seen over the period of years, you wind up by saying:

> While we support the concept of the school lunch program and have struggled for almost 2 years to make it a reality for the poor children in our community, we feel that the real answer to the problems of the poor in this country lies with a guaranteed adequate income.

That is the hard truth of it; the cure for poverty is money.

GUARANTEED ANNUAL WAGE SEEMS BEST ANSWER

We attempt to avoid that ultimate action by getting money to them through a series of devices and programs such as the school lunch program, and the slippage and the waste is enormous, given the best of resolve. Probably if we had accountants who could audit society the audit would establish that it would cost not more directly to pay family units a figure that permits the maintenance in minimum decency of that family unit. There would be less waste. There wouldn't be the frustrations and the suspicions that are generated, as I say, by even the best structure. The most decently motivated administration of these programs which we set up are almost Rube Goldberg-designed so as to pretend it were not actually aware that a guaranteed annual income to an American family is the sensible way to do it. I know that is not yet a very acceptable political concept, but it is my hunch that that is the direction in which, over a very bumpy road, we are moving. We will all be better off when we reach the day that that is our policy. I doubt that I shall live to see it.

Mrs. PARSACA. Thank you very much.

Senator HART. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. CASSIDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Parsaca, do you have any suggestions for resolving the problems of unappetizing quality of food in the program?

Mrs. PARSACA. I would suggest that if our superintendent and Mr. Lancashire, the food service director, were to actually go into each school at noontime and walk up and down among the tables and talk to the children, the children themselves could tell them what is wrong with the food.

On one particular day in the elementary school they were serving a hotdog, a cold dish of beans and a cold, hard pat of butter on top of the beans, a jello salad to the children. What is a child going to do with a hard pat of butter on top of cold beans? It doesn't look very appetizing. I don't care how hungry you were. In some cases children were not eating the butter, they were passing it down to the kids who were very hungry, but it isn't very appetizing.

We have gone to the food caterer. We have seen many menu plans they have prepared. They are good menu plans. They are what you could call kid menu plans. They have told us they worked for the board of education. They have submitted those plans to both Dr. Muth and Mr. Lancashire and they have been objecting to what they would consider were type A. One of the major objections, they didn't figure that pudding fit into the type A classification. I was a little outstanding. I give my kids pudding and I figure they are pretty well nourished.

We asked what they were going to do about it. The food people were very concerned at the amount of waste. They were very concerned at the small amount of food being put out. Of course they are in the business to make money, too. We asked them what they would suggest and they keep passing the buck right back to the board, right back to Mr. Lancashire and Dr. Muth. They are the total authority in our community.

I am most worried because a poor lunch is a good way of building in a self-destructive button in a community that did not want a lunch program to start with.

Mr. CASSIDY. Thank you.

Senator HART. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. BECKHAM. I have no questions.

Senator HART. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. KINNEY. I would like to make a couple of comments here which I think you have touched on briefly.

EMPLOY PARENTS AS MONITORS

You pointed out some of the areas we should be concerned about as we consider this program in providing services. No one can really blame a teacher for wanting to have a free lunch hour. I think we have pointed up a need here to provide some kind of support services or money in this area. This points to a need for some public service we have been talking about. Some of these parents would be employed who might not want to be on the welfare rolls in the long run, provide them a means of employment.

One point you made here is the volunteer employment where you have 500 people who are willing. You also recognize other children in the home, this hasn't been taken into consideration. There are other younger children, they can't be left. It points to another need to tie these programs in with the total concept.

You mentioned, Mr. Chairman, many programs are so fragmented that people who are recipients of the programs are unaware of the programs and you point out a need to send out newsletters. You and I both know that certain numbers of people don't read mail, so we need to get them into the media to which they listen, the stations or the Spanish-American speaking stations, where we can get the message to the people.

It points to the fact that ignorance of the law does not excuse anyone, but it prohibits one taking advantage of what is available to him. I think we have a responsibility to make sure people understand the school lunch program and certainly can appreciate good comments along these lines.

Mr. Chairman, you also pointed out some things here as relates to the guaranteed income, some of the things you and other Members of Congress have been concerned about on a day-to-day basis, a proposal of family assistance programs, the Federal revenue-sharing programs give greater control to trying to alleviate the financial burdens on the city and State and local governments.

I think some of the irresponsiveness that these State or local legislators are showing points up many reasons why many people, especially in the poor communities, can't accept this concept at this particular time. I think everyone will agree that we certainly need to be moving in some direction, and again I would like to thank you for your comments.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the fact you are directing us to the grassroots people so we can get at the thrust of the probem.

Senator **Hart**. How many VISTA workers are with you?

Mr. **DiMattia**. We have 10 currently. You mean working on the lunch program?

Senator **Hart**. Both, actually. I had in mind the school lunch program.

Mr. **DiMattia**. I have been working kind of full time; others are part time, on and off.

Mrs. **Parsaca**. I would like to make a comment to that. VISTA kids are kind of special in our lives. Whenever there is a problem, even if they aren't concerned with the school lunch thing, you can usually pick up the phone and say, kids, I have a problem, can you help, and they are there. But Bob has been, during his whole time since he has been in VISTA, part of the school lunch scene.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you both again.

Our next witness is the principal of the Jefferson School in Grand Rapids, Mr. Anthony Smith.

STATEMENT OF ANTHONY R. SMITH, PRINCIPAL, JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, GRAND RAPIDS

Mr. **Smith**. Senator Hart and members of the committee, this represents kind of a bird's-eye view of unsubstantiated evidence collected by myself with two other individuals that gives you kind of a bird's-eye view of the lunch program.

All of us are aware that some children who attend school are hungry.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Smith, would you state, in case I misstated it, for the record, your position in the Grand Rapids school system?

Mr. **Smith**. I am the principal of Jefferson School.

All of us are aware that some children who attend school are hungry, and we know that children who are poorly nourished and tired, especially in cold and wet weather, cannot learn well. We believe that a child's physical and emotional needs are basic to his being able to learn. We are all trying to cooperate so that a child's school experience can be of the greatest value to him.

The national school lunch program has a positive effect on health, learning behavior, social behavior, and attendance on the children that it serves.

Attendance, Health, and Achievement

We find that our children attend school more regularly. Our absentee rate has gone down from approximately 8 percent to 6 percent. We feel that our children are achieving more because they are in school more. The boys and girls seem to be more alert, more comfortable, and less anxious since we started the lunch program.

Senator **Hart**. How long have you had the lunch program?

Mr. **Smith**. We had it since February.

The statement above is a strong opinion and its effects on achievement have not been substantiated. Data is being gathered from all personnel; administrators, teachers, custodians, cooks, parents, et cetera, who are involved in the lunch program for an evaluation. This data will be ready the last of May. This evaluation is due May 26.

Senator Hart. We would welcome receiving for our records whatever the results are.

Mr. Smith. Fine.

On the control of students, behavior in the classroom has improved according to a sampling of teachers, that is, more alert, attentive, and therefore they are making more educational gains. However, this presents a different kind of control program on the playground, et cetera. We find that it is very difficult to keep children on school grounds and not wandering away to neighborhood stores or visiting friends at noon time. This is different in elementary schools are opposed to the high schools. We are charged with the safety of our youth, keeping them under control because of the age factor and safety of the boys and girls.

Effects on Curriculum

The national lunch program has created more enthusiasm and involvement in all disciplines. Teachers can prepare meaningful lesson plans specifically in science, health, and nutrition. All of my teachers feel this and now we are talking about pros and cons we don't understand.

The effects on staffs in the city of Grand Rapids are many and varied. Serving lunch in schools in our city is completely new. Our system has been mainly made up of neighborhood schools and all the children had gone home before this time in the past for lunch. Very few if any of our personnel have had any experience with lunch programs. With this implementation in February, teachers' lunch periods had to be shortened. Many were afraid they would lose their negotiated duty-free lunch time. Schedules had to be changed completely. Consultants' times and extracurricular activities all had to be changed drastically to work in the lunch period. The readjustment of time schedules, especially the physical education curriculum, required special consideration. We started our lunch program in February. Many of the teachers felt more preservice was necessary. The custodians found that their work load increased and little time was left to get the multipurpose room ready for the next activity. The multipurpose room in this case was the gymnasium, and in many cases it is still existing.

The cooks were very happy because they were given full-time employment. The bulk of the responsibility fell on the shoulder of the building administrator for total organization and implementation of the lunch program.

Effects on the Community—Pro and Con

The community was very happy to see the schools adopt a lunch program. Because of a number of activities the parents are involved in during the day, mainly work—I guess I am speaking of a segment of our community, by and large the poor people of our community don't feel well about our adoption of the lunch program—they were relieved to have their children receiving a nutritional lunch. The lunch program also provided an economic relief. Passage of the recent local millage was believed to be due in part to the lunch program, probably because of the fact we felt the poor people in our system passed the millage. We are fortunate in our State, as you know.

Introduction of foods that ethnic groups are not accustomed to is a complaint. Another is not serving enough, especially to older children. Parents are critical of converted facilities, not understanding total organization. There are problems of children not responding to new lunch staff; large urban staffs create a large number of adults for children to be identified with. Failure to understand why children could not wander around and through buildings. These were some of the problems, talking about organizational problems, that parents did not understand.

Facilities and Locations

Very few of the older buildings were equipped so that they could absorb a lunch program easily. A lack of bathrooms, sinks, lighting, and exists made shifts very difficult. In most schools, children ate in the gymnasium. Time for setting up, removing tables, and cleaning had to be kept at a minimum. Classes in the afternoon had to be curtailed while working the "bugs" out of the operation.

In some ways I think our lunch program could be improved. Some improvements of the lunch program: Larger quantities of food for children. It would appear that children, depending on size and age, would require larger portions of foods. I am sure that research would support this to some degree. And I qualify this because I think we are talking about subsistence, minimum amounts, when you say a 6-year-old should have the same amount or proportion of food as a 10-year-old.

More Appealing Foods, Same Nutritional Value

Perhaps it would be more advantageous to serve children food that they are accustomed to having served. Not that children should not be introduced to many of the gourmet dishes but we should remember that palates and taste take a while to be appreciated. A choice of healthy beverages other than milk, chocolate milk, orange juice, lemonade.

Problem Areas Many Schools Have at Present Time

Because of our lack of facilities, we don't have facilities for storage of wraps; bathroom and water at this time; inclement weather; little involvement of teachers because of negotiated free lunches; large number of persons on a staff that children must be familiar with; difference of opinion as to whether children should have breakfast instead of lunch and/or both; wandering through the building at lunch time of unauthorized groups and many items have come up missing at this particular time; disposal and storage of extra food due to absenteeism; most foods not prepared on site, for example, fresh fruits would be more appealing if it would be cut in a lunchroom facility; number and the proximity of schools to commercial areas, as related to children bringing money to school and leaving the playground; total child population on the playground at noon. There is a wide chronological age represented which leads itself to social problems. Small increment of lunch personnel. By that I mean the personnel to work and help us at lunch time, I think for 1 hour 20 minutes you receive about $3. The staff leaves when full-time, higher paying position are available.

I must note that all buildings don't have the same facility and organizational problems.

My summary: This is a new program, and it is important to come to grips with these problems to improve the quality of the program. I am convinced that many of these problems will be eliminated as we gain more expertise in this area. The national lunch program is a definite asset to the children in our schools.

Senator Hart. Mr. Smith, that is a very helpful statement. It is based on about a 4-month experience. How many children are in the Jefferson Elementary?

Mr. Smith. At the present time, 603.

Senator Hart. What percentage of that 600 participate in the lunch program?

Mr. Smith. I would say about 60 percent.

Senator Hart. Are you able to estimate how many are eligible, but for one reason or another do not participate?

Mr. Smith. I am always afraid of estimates. I found some very knowledgeable information after going through and entering questionnaires and reviewing applications. I found at least 70 or 75 percent of our parents were on welfare rolls or ADC with children. At that time I thought it was about 40 percent. Our community is class changing. It is the urban type where there is vertical mobility and we tend to move east. There is also the kind of mobility we have an in-migration as well as an immigration into a particular area. This is the place where we come into the city of Grand Rapids where my school is located. I think there is a cosmobility there, 50 percent of my kids change at the end of a given year.

Balanced Report Most Helpful

Senator Hart. The reason I said I thought your statement was helpful, it is a balanced kind of report, it identifies some shortcomings, it notes the advances, and then makes the judgment that the gains justify the efforts. I think it is the kind of statement that a person who is unsure as to whether we should really push this effort towards school feeding would be most apt to be persuaded by.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Smith, have you been able to work out a satisfactory plan for teacher time, especially their free time within the lunch program, where they can still participate in supervision?

Mr. **Smith.** First of all, I am not an advocate, especially, I realize a teacher is the best vehicle to help me do my job with kids. Also I realize that they negotiated for local representation. I would say some of my help is volunteer. I would say the bulk of carrying out the total responsibility is an administrative one. They do help at times. We have six lunchroom supervisors and that presents a problem inasmuch as these particular individuals are changing all the time, and it is only on a part-time basis.

I would say no to your question, I don't think this is satisfactory inasmuch as I think we could eliminate many kinds of things if our total staff were able to gear ahead with its particular concern.

Mr. **Cassidy.** Do the children in your schools still choose to go home if they want, can they?

Mr. **Smith.** Yes.

Mr. **Cassidy.** Thank you.

Mr. **Beckham.** I have one question.

On the same order as Mr. Cassidy, in your opinion, does the lack of involvement of the teachers in the school lunch program work counter to making school lunch a part of the full education process, say, in your school or public school. I am speaking now, of earlier testimony relating to the need to begin to recognize this as a part of the total responsibility of educating. Teachers are negotiating themselves out of the program. We run counter, don't we, to this theory, to this possibility?

Mr. **Smith.** I think, well, it depends. After we have initiated a program, I think many of the teachers can see some real positive kinds of things and how nutrition relates to education. I think this is something that educators, at least we out in the field, feel, perhaps, that teachers have not given some thought to. I do know the N.E.A., it is their platform for teachers, they want duty-free time, at the same time I am saying that those in any given community, in any given elementary school is most effective working with the kids because of poor rapport with the teachers. I don't know how we can resolve it but that would be my interest.

Mr. **Beckham.** Thank you.

Senator **Hart.** Mr. Kinney.

Mr. **Kinney.** I am particularly concerned about the breakfast area. The word breakfast comes from break the fast. This has been a long expanse of time that an individual does without a meal.

I would like to direct this question, what are some of the supporting arguments in favor of the breakfast program as opposed to the lunch program?

MOST PRODUCTIVE LEARNING TIME—MORNING

Mr. **Smith.** I think there is a time span. The second one I would say, and I am not an official expert, but in terms of energy, I understand breakfast has more energizing agents in the foods.

A third one, we in education believe the most productive part, the learning time of students occurs in the morning area, and our thinking would be if a youngster would be more alert at that time, it would probably be more productive to him in the nutritional way as well as educationally. I think that is a rationale.

Mr. **Kinney.** We certainly hope your evaluation will point out some of these arguments for the sake of entering into the record at a later time because you are right, if you have stated in here the kid's behavior is better, functioning better, everyone would attest to the fact that nutritional portion has something to do with his learning. If he has gone without food from 6 o'clock in the afternoon, that points up another point there. You say about 70 percent of these students are from families which qualify to be on public assistance, which means probably a great deal or practically all of your students would probably be in need of both meals, as opposed to one or the other.

I appreciate your comments and will certainly give some direction to the director's programs.

Thank you.

Senator **Hart.** Was there much debate within the employees, from the principal to custodian, in the school over whether or not the school should enter into the program?

Mr. **Smith.** In a school or all schools?

Senator **Hart.** In yours.

Mr. **Smith.** I think that is a true statement. I think any time you have change, how we are going to work this in now, how much more can we take on, you know, really when are we going to be adequately compensated for the things we are taking on. Am I perpetuating a welfare syndrome. Yes, all those kinds of things, that is the kind of interaction and discourses you will hear all the time.

Mr. **Beckham.** This is more a comment rather than a question. I think you, in your testimony, clearly make the point that given a principal or a person who is more immediately responsible for a program like school lunch or any program, given the initiative, the foresight, objectivity, and the desire to do it makes a heck of a lot of difference. Clearly the reason it is going as it is going in your schools is because you have decided to make a No. 1 commitment to it. I think it is fair to say that the relevancy, you being a black principal, predominantly black children, the background and understanding you have clearly lends itself to making the program work, because my guess is, by you being the person you are, the students feel a lot more comfortable, a lot more willing to participate than they might have felt given a different personality.

Mr. **Smith.** Thank you.

Senator **Hart.** Our concluding witness before we take a brief recess is the Superintendent of Public Schools of Grand Rapids. We welcome Mr. Phillip Runkel.

STATEMENT OF PHILLIP RUNKEL, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, GRAND RAPIDS; ACCOMPANIED BY DAVE LANCASHIRE, FOOD SERVICE DIRECTOR

Mr. **Runkel.** I have not prepared a statement for you, but I want to go over some things.

Dave, do you want to come up, too. There may be some questions.

Senator **Hart.** Mr. Runkel, you proceed as you think it would be helpful for the record.

Mr. **Runkel.** My name is Phillip Runkel, Superintendent of Schools in Grand Rapids, Mich.

I came to the city of Grand Rapids on the job on December 14. Prior to that time there was a controversy over hot lunch filed in the newspaper. I came to the suburb of Detroit—Utica, Mich.— and certainly I was appalled to know in the cities there was not a hot lunch program, and because I saw very well, where the need was the greatest, we in our community were not really addressing ourselves to that problem.

I think the statements on the things that happened were the history in Grand Rapids in terms of hot lunch. I felt sincerely we ought to move the program. That was in December. Putting the programs together at this time was not easy. There were many problems externally and internally.

One, it was almost impossible for us in our capacity to produce hot lunches in the satellite kitchens at that time. We felt the best way to go was to cater the lunches. We had an animosity internally. I think Tony summarized it very well. The principals of the 17 schools where we implemented the program were sympathetic and understanding and I think did a very good job in terms of implementing the program.

The first task we ought to address ourselves to, which we had the greatest urgency, was the 18 title I schools out of a total of 52 schools.

Then we put the program together from a realistic standpoint because board members on our board had had various positions on this occasion and were split on this issue. We did put this together and did adopt the policy.

Fund Shortage in Many Areas

One of the reasons that our policy was somewhat restrictive and maybe did not address itself to the total use at that time was our understanding of funds available. I recognize that we were concerned about local funds in these program because we were already short in many areas.

We did proceed and, as you can see in the statistical data I have given you, we are addressing ourselves to a larger number of children than ever before. So in implementing the program we had to work on several various problems.

First of all, the board would take a policy position; second, send it to our administrators to get them ready for the implementation of programs. We did this in several ways. We observed this in several cities, Philadelphia, Detroit, to look at existing programs and to study what could be done there. We then purchased the necessary equipment and tables and had them here by the time the program started.

There have been problems with the program. I think maybe the suggestions that have been made by both Tony and Barb have to be looked at, and we are in the process of doing that. We are now evaluating the program and we will be taking a sampling of our total community to get their feeling on what ways we ought to expand the program. I feel that somehow the city may have been misled. I think there is a stronger urgency for a lunch program in the schools in this city than many people give credit.

For example, in the outlying areas as well as the inner city, I believe ultimately the lunch program will be adopted in all of the schools in Grand Rapids.

I would make a couple of comments in regard to legislation at the State level. I think the State has to take a stronger position in terms of supporting the program, and I believe if the program is there, then I think some of the suggestions I have heard this morning in terms of affirmative action may be considered, and also I believe the State department of education has to have the staff, a larger percentage of staff, to address itself to the problems around the State. I also feel that they need to be able to have staff to collect data in terms of each city so they can help school administrators in the various areas address themselves to the needs of that community.

We will be moving ahead with our program and I believe probably expanding it in terms of the future. It has had problems and many of them have been addressed. I am convinced over the long run we will be able to solve any of these problems.

The suggestions today were meaningful in terms of communication, although we have made an effort to settle appeal cases and have directed our principals, and the system may have broken down someplace, we will get at that and find out why.

COMMITTED TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

We are now, I think, having some impact and some rapport with children who have a need for this program, and I am committed to improve the program and move the program ahead. We will be doing a sample of our total community in regard to the hot lunch program, participants and people who may not be participating who may desire the program, so we will have some good data in terms of where to move.

I think that basically summarizes my testimony.

Senator **HART.** Thank you very much and congratulations.

What kind of progress, if it isn't pushing, do you expect to make? You say you have 17 or 18 schools in this group that now participate. What are the circumstances that would persuade you and the board and another school to participate?

Mr. **RUNKEL.** I think we have some of the fringe area schools we ought to look at. I am sure we have a high influence of children in those schools that need it. It think that the total community must be involved. Also I think if we really have the data, I don't think we have the data about how our people really feel about the hot lunch.

For example, the millage survey, I think we have to have good data. We hear people on this and that side of the street talk about it. We can talk in this neighborhood and that neighborhood, but really what kind of data do we have? Usually people who speak the loudest are heard, but what does John and Mary Doe really feel about a lunch bill in the school. For example, for the whole people in the city we are going to have to provide the same kind of services. For example, if I lived in Kentwood, the kid would be driven to school and he would have a hot lunch program. If I lived in

Grand Rapids and we don't get State transportation services, so we don't have bus service in terms of that if you live 2 miles from the school, then you have to pick the kid up at noon. I am just talking about working mothers. I think that people are misreading the views of the citizenry of our community.

I am sure there is opposition and there is, but I want to address ourselves to the whole issue. That may be over a couple of years. I am not here to commit that at this time, but I think, if it can happen in suburban Grand Rapids, then I think it can happen throughout the country and I feel strongly about that.

Senator Hart. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy. Do you have a dietician or nutrition or professional food staff?

Mr. Runkel. Yes; Mr. Lancashire may want to address himself to that.

Mr. Cassidy. Does that employee review the menu plan and evaluate the meals that are served?

Mr. Lancashire. We have a nutritionist who is primarily in charge of the home economics program of the schools. She assists me in the menus.

Any Food Rejection/Waste Study?

Mr. Cassidy. The problem of food being acceptable to the children, have you done any sort of a study of rejection or waste?

Mr. Runkel. I have a comment on that.

One, I have walked down the hall and seen the food and there are, I think, some problems. I think that Dave may want to address himself more to that kind of thing. However, in any suburban school district or someplace you have a hot lunch program you have given menus at a given time where you have that time to waste, I am sorry, we do. You are not going to eliminate that problem altogether ever.

Mr. Cassidy. Have you formed an opinion in your mind that there should be certain changes perhaps in the type A lunch that would still provide a nutritious meal but improve its acceptability?

Mr. Runkel. I have some idea. Dave may want to comment on that. He is more of an expert in that area.

Believes Type A Menus Behind Times

Mr. Lancashire. I do. Senator Hart, you made a visit to the churches in the area. They are not currently following the type A menu in many, many cases, but they are feeding the kids and they are feeding the kids basically what they want. I think the type A menu, the specifications laid out as today, are about 25 years behind the times.

Senator Hart. Behind the times in terms of taste or nutrition?

Mr. Lancashire. Nutritionally they are up to date but we also have to cater to today's children.

Mr. Runkel. We have different children.

Mr. Cassidy. What would you think of the situation where you could change the meal patterns, make them more acceptable, make the type A lunch a more acceptable lunch and include some type of vitamin supplement and allow you that type of flexibility, do you think you would have wide acceptability among the parents and the school board and your nutritionist?

Mr. **Runkel.** We have done some things. South Middle School recently had an ethnic day, in terms of that kind of thing, and I think if you are having hot lunches, there are certain techniques that have to be utilized, maximized; for example, the things we used to do where I came from, maybe have an international day, various kinds. Maybe we would have Chinese food and then give a little prize, you know, in terms of little Chinese trinkets. The hotdog and hamburger were always the best seller. Nevertheless, you have different kind of tastes from different ethnic groups. You have to address yourself to that.

It could be a growth of experience. There could be a lot of things that happen, you know, in terms of understanding of other people. I would have no objection to that. I think it might be a very good suggestion.

Dave, if you want to comment on it.

Mr. **Beckham.** Grand Rapids tends to highlight, I think, again that leadership, one person in the right spot, is responsible for getting the ball rolling. Before you came things were at a dead standstill and the board was going in the opposite direction you are going now. You read the situation right and you acted.

Mr. **Runkel.** The next action is to move.

Mr. **Beckham.** You made a commitment.

Mr. **Runkel.** I am committed to the program. I am not sure, it doesn't necessarily mean it is going to move.

Mr. **Beckham.** A question on the quality of the food. Everybody is pretty much saying the type A lunch is not necessarily appetizing or appealing, but yet it meets nutritional standards. You are saying you would like to get flexibility.

Mr. **Runkel.** I would like the kid to eat the food.

Food for the Poor—Not Poor Food

Mr. **Beckham.** That is the earlier statement about getting the food in first. In the programs to deal with the poor, it is easier for those of us responsible for setting the program up to set certain standards on the board, surplus foods, because maybe it is a way of getting rid of it, mass production shortcutting, because they have to do it in this kind of way. Food for the poor should not be poor food, regardless of the nutritional requirements. Starting off new, you can probably turn that whole cycle around, because I think in a lot of the school systems in the State of Michigan this is part of the problem. The program has been in for 10 or 12 years. It is so set, I think, in the notion what we have been doing. Meet the standards. It is there, if the kids don't want it, we will try to get it and educate them to what good it does for them.

Mr. **Runkel.** Although we use some of this food, I think what happens, some of this bureaucracy builds the menus for the last 12 years and they circulate the doggoned thing for the next 12.

What I think catering does bring into the picture is a new approach, a competitive kind of thing. Recognizing that may have problems, we recognize we have had. We had some heating problems, giving fish one day, it was a bad deal. We gave everybody a free lunch. It was wrong, it wasn't cooked, in no way was it cooked. We failed that day. We addressed ourselves to that. That is going to happen with any kind of a mechanism. I am sorry about that, but it will happen. It seems that does show some promise in terms of that.

I get concerned about your building a big kitchen and getting locked into the same kinds of things, the same menu over 12 years, because it becomes easy to produce. You don't challenge yourself in doing things differently and that is where you really get buried. Then your count goes down and you say, why is our count going down because you know, if you talk to kids, they will tell you, I think Barbara's point is right. We are doing some of that, we are doing a survey with parents right now, and we will submit the results to you.

Mr. **Kinney**. What constitutes eligibility for free or reduced price lunches?

Mr. **Runkel**. If Dave would comment on that.

Mr. **Lancashire**. We were following the guidelines set by the Federal Government. I don't remember those offhand, maybe Barb does. We do not deviate from that at all.

Mr. **Kinney**. In previous testimony there was objection to the fact, in changing guidelines you eliminated supervision.

Mr. **Runkel**. Pretty well.

Mr. **Kinney**. Has that been corrected?

Mr. **Runkel**. Yes, it has been corrected.

Mr. **Kinney**. You mentioned the desires to obtain data relative to the feel of the people regarding the school lunch program. I am sure you would like to address yourself to this portion of this particular statement. I think that would have to have some relevancy to the need as relates to the number of children in need of food in particular.

You have all the people, as you say, the people who make the most noise, you will find the people who are hungry and poor don't make the noise, they don't know the right mechanism or certain kinds of controls, and I have been very much concerned about certain communities who talk about good work relationships and not relating that work relationship to the controls of a particular establishment might have over a particular community. I think any data that would reflect upon the decisions to be made relative to any kind of program would have to take this under consideration.

Mr. **Runkel**. First of all, you have a need, we have to get data, first of all, people who are using the program. That is not easy because poor people don't have telephones. You are going to have to be more personalizing and so forth.

RECOGNIZE THEY HAVE A NEED

We also recognize there are many schools who may not be the same percentage. Tony's percentage is higher. What project we follow is feeding the kids there, probably about 80 percent, but we recognize they also have a need.

How do we address ourselves to secure data there? We will secure from an American firm the kinds of problems in utilizing the firm in this kind of endeavor, recognizing the very specific kinds, data can be data, but we want to get at the problems. We are not trying to build the data up against the program here, what problems we have, how we improve it, where do we go from here. You have to get data. You can have a group come here and there, but we have to say scientifically this is what the poor people in this town think. There is a need and a problem. Where do we go from here in these problems. So that is what I am talking about.

Mr. **Kinney.** That is good.

Let me kind of back up here to some other things which might have been said before. I have been very much concerned about the need to tie in nutritional programs within the curriculum system of a particular school. Are you concerned about making sure that the kids eat the food and everyone is concerned about kids going toward habits, if a kid gets up in the morning and buys bubble gum, he is going to buy it no matter what type of food is available. I think you need to tie this package in some way to provide the kind of training——

Mr. **Runkel.** We have some things going in terms of nutrition classes for mothers. But we need to do a lot more. The point of how you bring the staff, we had, you know, a sizable amount of opposition from our staff, not too many problems once we are up there. Of course, this is tradition, some are pretty bad, the change. Is this going to happen, how is this going to affect me, which we all think of. How do we bring staff members back in? We could do that several ways.

One, you know we ought to be addressing ourselves to particularly the schools with some specific kinds of people, and, you know, more than I do, about nutrition and how you implement the program, ought to develop some service programs in those schools. For example, Tony's schools, start with two or three starter schools and build a pattern.

You see, we hire a teacher for that kind of work, you know, the expenditure increases. That may be another step we may have to go to. We may have to hire specific teachers to work with the principal in that kind of program. You get all of these demands.

In Kentwood they have been doing it for years. They don't need a differential. These are the kind of things, we are going to go ahead with the program. You get down to this, you teach. We will feed them, we will live by our agreement, but now we get back to the other kinds of things, you see.

Mr. **Kinney.** Thank you.

Senator **Hart.** Gentlemen, thank you very much. I think all of us have the feeling that the progress in Grand Rapids is identifiable, encouraging, and I hope it will bring satisfaction to those who have been so long concerned about it.

The data that is provided to the committee by Mr. Runkel and Mr. Lancashire will be made a part of the record.*

Senator **Hart.** We will recess, to resume at 1:30 o'clock.

(Whereupon, the committee recessed at 1 p.m., to reconvene at 1:30 p.m.)

---

*See Appendix 1, p. 1496.

73

74

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1971—AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator HART. The committee will be in order.

Before proceeding to our scheduled witnesses for the afternoon, at recess I was approached by a group who explained they had been here during the morning and had anticipated being able to testify at the end of the day; however, they must leave by 3 o'clock. They indicated their testimony would consume about 2 minutes. With apologies to those who have been scheduled, I would welcome Mr. Alan Maki of Grand Rapids, of the Young Workers Liberation League.

Mr. Maki.

STATEMENT OF ALAN MAKI, ORGANIZATIONAL SECRETARY, GRAND RAPIDS BRANCH, YOUNG WORKERS LIBERATION LEAGUE

Mr. MAKI. We have all heard the problem, we all know the problem basically, feeding the 300,000 hungry schoolchildren in the State of Michigan.

Someone posed the problem that it is a question of books or free lunches. We are sick and tired with being faced with the problem of books or lunches when the Vietnam war is costing us, the taxpayers, working and poor people, enough to pay for both books and lunches, much more in fact. The 300,000 hungry schoolchildren in the State of Michigan are being denied a free lunch, they are starving, because the Vietnam war is costing us $120,000 every 74 seconds. It would cost $120,000 to feed the 300,000 hungry schoolchildren in the State of Michigan per day, using Mr. Porter's figure of 40 cents per lunch. That means that the 300,000 hungry schoolchildren in Michigan could have a free lunch every day for 1 whole year for what the Vietnam war is costing us every 8 hours.

The Vietnam war is not the only reason children are going hungry, though it is the main reason. Farmers are being paid not to grow crops. We say that this money, hundreds of thousands of dollars, should be used by the Government to purchase seed, pay decent union wages to the unemployed, and purchase whatever else is necessary to grow this food that is needed for these hungry schoolchildren. This would also cut the cost of lunches and provide jobs for the unemployed.

We demand:

(1) Lunches, not war;

(2) A free lunch for every child whose family has an income less than $6,500 a year (family of four);

(3) That the children of the unemployed be given free lunches;

(4) That all needed funds be obtained by a tax on the large corporations, General Motors, et cetera, and no taxes on incomes less than $10,000 a year;

(5) We also support the statement of Mrs. Parsaca.

Senator Hart. Mr. Maki, thank you. You have introduced a note that I think is a help and I think many of the readers of this record will agree with every suggestion you make.

To help put this thing in focus, you remind me of another comparison that is a rather frequently used one now. The Federal Government, on the average, spends about $240 a year to teach those in primary and secondary schools, and spends $7,800 a year to train those in the military to kill.

I welcome your testimony. Thank you.

Mr. Maki. We thank you for allowing us to testify.

Senator Hart. Let me welcome the executive director of the Lansing Schools Education Association, Mr. James Hengstebeck.

Mr. Hengstebeck. Correction Senator. I am the president of the Lansing Schools Education Association.

Senator Hart. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JAMES HENGSTEBECK, PRESIDENT, LANSING SCHOOLS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. Hengstebeck. My name is James Hengstebeck. I am president of the Lansing School Education Association.

Senator Hart, members of the committee, on behalf of the Lansing Schools Education Association, which represents approximately 1,500 elementary and secondary teachers in the Lansing School District, thank you for the opportunity to present to your committee our views on school lunch programs. We are very pleased that the U.S. Senate has come to Lansing, Mich., to hear the people on this issue. There are many people in the land today who attempt to create the impression that national leadership has developed a posture of aloofness from the feelings of constituents on the significant issues of the times. Your presence today is an instance of positive denial of that claim.

In addressing the matter under consideration, let me first state that our point of view will focus entirely on the need for and the problems connected with providing a lunch program for elementary pupils. That, in our opinion, is where the issue squarely rests, and ought to rest, as a matter of fact.

There are many who essentially believe that education ought to merely consist of developing skills in the three R's. Their line of reasoning is that it is not the business of the schools to provide for feeding kids, or any other related undertaking. This, they say, is the exclusive responsibility of the home, and taxpayers should not have to subsidize the same. Teachers, however, simply cannot accept that argument as being educationally valid.

We believe that while many parents, in fact, have the economic means to furnish their kids with daily nutritional requirements, there are great numbers who do not. Yet those parents are required by law, like everyone else, to send their boys and girls to school to learn basic skills and to become acquainted with the experiences, values, and customs of American society. At the same time it can be demonstrated by any test or index required that kids who lack minimum daily nutritional requirements, kids who are, bluntly, hungry, do not learn as well as those who are more economically fortunate. The question simply is, how can a little boy or girl who is suffering from hunger, fatigue, or pain concentrate on school lessons? Thus, on one hand we mandate school attendance, but, on the other hand, we are confronted with the awful reality that our statutory requirements abuse equal educational opportunity. That is, if parents cannot provide, then someone else must if we are going to insure that every member of the younger generation has an equal opportunity to achieve their terms of the American dream. Mr. Chairman, the only logical body to do what I have outlined is the National Government, for the problem is not unique to Lansing or the State of Michigan.

BUILDINGS NOT CONSTRUCTED TO FEED PUPILS

In terms of gaging the level of funding required, I would like to cite for you some of the problems the Lansing school district will encounter in providing lunch for elementary school children. The first consideration is that our buildings were not constructed so as to anticipate the need being discussed here today. We will have to have resources enough in order to plan space for a lunch program which will satisfy fire regulations, et cetera, and at the same time not impose greatly on necessary educational programs.

Feeding kids in a gym takes away from physical education. Feeding kids in a classroom infringes on the teaching atmosphere vis-a-vis sanitation. Sending kids home with a cold lunch raises obvious concerns about assurance that the child will actually have the chance to eat the lunch. We must also provide time for the child to get away from adult supervision, and vice versa, in order to release energy that would be inappropriate within the school building, like running and shouting. We also will have to cope with the problem of storing equipment, since few buildings have that kind of space. In brief, the list of problems that fall within the space or facility category are complex, but given the resources they probably could be made manageable.

Another need will be providing for adequate supervision. Teachers, like any other employee group are entitled to duty-free lunch periods of a reasonable length. If the intention is to ask them to give of their time, then they must be appropriately remunerated. A more desirable kind of supervision would be utilization of nonprofessional aides from the respective school communities. But nonprofessional supervision must receive some training commensurate with the responsibility of handling children. There must also be pay enough to attract qualified and dedicated help. Again, the problem is a complex one, but given the resources it can be managed.

A really "gut" level matter is the question of who the schools will feed. Will they feed all, regardless of parental preference? Will they feed just the needy? If so, how will we get around the problem of stigmatizing those kids so defined in the eyes of their peers and the community at large? Related to this general concern is how fees will be established and collected. Ideally and politically we ought to provide free lunches. That would "short cut" the questions raised above. Lacking the resources to do that, we must still have the funds necessary to provide necessary planning and administrative support.

Impractical To Charge Rated Fees

One other concern on the matter of fees for lunches, if we must assume that they will have to be charged, is the amount. At an earlier point in time when we were wrestling with the idea of an elementary lunch program in the Lansing school district, it was suggested that fees might be differentiated according to the child's need category. That is, it was suggested that there might be one rate for a child whose parents were not defined as being financially distressed and lesser amounts for children whose guardians are economically disadvantaged. This approach, in my mind, is not only administratively impractical but comes close to being unconscionable. Let us not brand the needy with a mark or symbol of their plight.

I would have no problem in itemizing for the committee more concerns than I have listed to this point. But, knowing that others here today will doubtlessly fill in any gaps, I should like to go back to the point made earlier about the need for the national Government to assume the responsibility for providing the resources to cope with the issue at hand. The emphasis this time, however, will be on financial realities confronting local school districts, especially Lansing, and the State of Michigan.

Candor requires me to say, and you will not be surprised to hear this, I am sure, that we are in the midst of a crisis that has the potential for a kind of revolution. Our schools are financed mainly by property taxes. Lansingites historically, until last year, supported their schools by voting the necessary property tax levies because they genuinely believed that quality education was the foundation of viable democracy. But spiraling inflation and other onerous economic forces have forced us to ask for levels of property taxation that are just unacceptable in the eyes of the property owner. On April 5, for example the Lansing Board of Education asked the voters to approve a basic operating levy of 24 mills. The outcome of that election was overwhelmingly negative. The request as a matter of fact, was beaten 2 to 1. The bitter irony is that the school district cannot afford to ask for less without endangering the continuance of fundamentally sound education. Yet it may have to do just that unless the State legislature can promise the taxpayer some relief in the near future

The State legislators, on the other hand, are looking in the eye of a multimillion dollar general deficit, something in the neighborhood of $60 million, depending on how one chooses to define his terms. The legislature, in other words, is in the untenable position of having to pick and choose between what deserves their attention first. Should they shortchange schools in order to meet the responsibility of the welfare problem? Should they shortchange the poor in order to meet the desperate needs of our urban centers? Briefly, to whom shall be given the distinctiion of wearing an "I've been had" label?

TAXPAYER CANNOT CARRY THE BURDEN

The point is that funds derived from property taxes to support school programs in this State have been exhausted. The individual taxpayer cannot carry the burden any longer. In Lansing he knows that 440 professional educators, his kids' teachers, have had to be pink-slipped because he didn't vote for the millage. He knows that fact borders on tragedy. He also knows that he cannot do it alone any longer.

I submit that our legislature must commit the people of this State to approving new ways of financing. This effort will necessarily involve arduous and prolonged political battle. The question simply will not be solved tomorrow.

In sum, while all of what I have just said is being worked out, hungry kids will still be trying to understand their school lessons. Their need cannot wait, however, until the financial crisis diminishes. Every day that goes by without providing for their need is another day of unequal educational opportunity. Every day that goes by without acknowledging the fact that hungry little boys and girls and the parents of the same cannot help themselves is another day of violating the constitutional principle of "equal protection" of the laws. The national Government must help us out in every way it can. Provide us with the resources, please.

Thank you, Senator Hart.

Senator Hart. Thank you, Mr. Hengstebeck.

In Lansing, junior and senior high schools do have a lunch program?

Mr. Hengstebeck. Yes, sir; that is correct, an open lunch period.

Senator Hart. An open lunch period.

Has there been any primary school that has undertaken to have a feeding program that you are aware of?

Mr. Hengstebeck. I am not particularly in a position to answer that question authoritatively, Senator. There are those here who can. As I alluded to in my statement, we tried to wrestle with the kids, the needy kids, especially in the model cities area this year. I think we do feed in primary schools but on a limited basis. I may, in fact, stand corrected on that.

Senator Hart. Let me give you a hypothetical, and I may cast it a little unfairly. Restructuring the State revenue system, as you say, will take a long time, or at least there is no reason to think it is around the corner. The Federal Government provides under the existing school feeding laws some moneys. It would appear it is not sufficient to expand the facilities where none exist or expand existing facilities that are inadequate or provide new facilities for feeding, it may require the use of classrooms or gymnasiums. State change of revenue for support of the school programs and school feeding is in the dim future. The Federal Government is unwilling to do more than it now is. You say that that produces a day where a child—it is another day of unequal educational opportunity. Notwithstanding the burdens that are imposed by the inadequacy of the Federal program and the virtual lack of support at the State level, could someone fairly say, but nonetheless, until that situation is improved a school, a principal and teacher, and all associated with the school system, should sign on to do what is possible under the existing limits thereby reducing, to some extent, the inequality of the educational opportunities for the poor child? How do you respond to that inquiry?

Teachers Try To Meet Challenges

Mr. Hengstebeck. I think generally you will find, at least in Michigan, that teachers do and will, in fact, respond to the need in lieu of something more substantial as I have outlined it. I can tell you I think, candidly again, initially this year in Lansing we considered a demonstration program essentially in the model cities area and that program, as it was designed, in fact, bordered on if not indeed violated the terms of the teachers' master contract, and naturally I am sure that you are aware we are very sensitive about that kind of thing. That is, the right to collective bargaining in Michigan for teachers has only been around about 5 years or so, but we, nevertheless, sat down in Lansing with administrators and cooperatively worked our way through the terminology of the master agreement, et cetera, in an effort to meet the needs of kids. In short, Senator, I am saying that teachers, God bless them, are still for kids and will try to meet the challenges of the day. I can say that for Lansing and I think I can say that for most of the teachers in the State of Michigan.

Senator Hart. I appreciate the answer. My question or comment was not to suggest that the make-do is something that I would say should be done and one could very well argue to the extent you make-do you reduce the pressures to improve and therefore are really doing a disservice to the kids. But you and I know perfectly well there are those who have a rather strong feeling that the absence of the more perfect model does not justify our failure to work to make as useful as possible, and that is the reason.

Mr. Hengstebeck. Again, very quickly, I want to respond, though we are not debating the issue, I am sure. Yes, we can make-do, but there are 33,000 kids in this district alone, many of whom are, more than just a few of whom are, hungry and there is no way—I believe I heard the previous gentleman allude to the fact there are some 300,000 kids in the Nation who are affected by hunger daily—you are not going to meet that need on a make-do basis day in and day out, you just can't, no way.

Senator Hart. We indeed are not debating that, we are agreeing. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could you enlarge on the infringement of the school lunch room as one of the attributes in the teaching classroom? I think that would be worthwhile to get into, because I think that is something that will probably come up more and I would like to understand what you mean.

Mr. Hengstebeck. Simply, I believe that in other districts in the State, and I am sure throughout the Nation, they have wrestled with this problem of the need for facilities and buildings that weren't really designed to provide or have a lunch program in them, and the route or path, at least, the easiest path in this regard is to utilize classrooms. This is where the child spends a major portion of his day and it just seems to follow naturally that the classroom is an easy facility and a logical facility to use. However, I think that that ignores a couple of facts that are so very important to the child's basic instruction.

WRONG—FEED AND TEACH IN SAME ROOM

No. 1, that room is there as a place to develop the skills and the overall education of the child and its atmosphere for that purpose is too critical to expect that we can feed lunch in that room as well as teach basic skills or instruct the child in the ways of American society, is really asking too much of the teacher who is responsible for the housekeeping and the other administrative tasks that go along with that room, and really expecting too much of the child as well. You, in effect, so far as the child is concerned, are confining him to a classroom for practically the entirety of his school day. You are providing him with no way to get away by keeping him there for an additional period of time.

Of course there is the problem of smells, the sandwiches and banana peelings, and the problem of litter from packages and spills on the floor. All of these sorts of things serve to detract from the educational purpose of the classroom, I think.

I think also, however, it may just have to be necessary that classrooms will have to be utilized for feeding children. If that is the case, then we ought to be prepared to furnish the teacher with some kind of nonprofessional assistance to manage the task. If we can avoid, by nature of the building's construction, feeding the child anyplace but the classroom, then we at least ought to be prepared to give the teachers some professional assistance. I think this idea of nonprofessional assistance has an advantage which is highly commendable. Sometimes, I guess, educators feel there is a gap between themselves and the community that they serve. There are a lot of people "out there" who don't have a schoolhouse feel, as it were, and for that reason they don't understand what it is that the schools are doing for their kids. And this is the need, I think, nonprofessional assistance of bringing the people into the school to give them a schoolhouse feel and emphasize our successes or our purpose rather than continually detracting from the program.

Mr. Cassidy. What you are saying, I think you could fairly say the problems are not insurmountable, they are real problems that can be dealt with?

Mr. Hengstebeck. I beg your pardon? I am sorry.

Mr. Cassidy. The problem, the infringement into the classroom atmosphere, it is a real problem but it can be dealt with.

Mr. Hengstebeck. Absolutely.

How Did Teachers Compromise To Help?

Mr. **Cassidy**. What compromises did the Lansing teachers help to bring about a school feeding program in Lansing?

Mr. **Hengstebeck**. I think it is important to say at the outset that the best laid plans of mice and men in this instance in the end went astray for reasons other than teacher-placed obstacle or a board of education-placed obstacle. However, I will let others discuss that issue if you wish to discuss it. But to speak directly to your question, we simply had to ask our teachers in lieu of the contractual terms to consider reducing the length of their lunch period and in some instances consider supervising voluntarily lunch programs without, well, with remuneration, of course, but, in essence, our master agreement simply prescribes against those kinds of things happening. And in reality for those kinds of things to happen we would have had to go through a formal bargaining procedure which was not scheduled to begin until the close of this school year. But instead of going to the bargaining table to try to work out the differences, we, instead, opted to work them out informally, away from the bargaining table, in order that everybody's business might be accommodated for kids. If this meant reducing the length of the lunch period, fine; if this meant providing teachers' services, supervisory services, on a voluntary basis, fine, we condone it and we endorse it.

Mr. **Cassidy**. Thank you.

Mr. **Beckham**. I have two questions.

If you were asked to weigh the present particular advantage of a school lunch program in an elementary school against another type of lunch program, either as it is set up now or by kids bringing bag lunches; any type other than the prescribed national school lunch program; if you were asked to weigh the two as it relates to serving the total educational needs of elementary school children, what would tend to be your decision?

Mr. **Hengstebeck**. Mr. Beckham, I have to confess ignorance. What is the national school lunch program?

Mr. **Beckham**. Then I will try to keep it brief. I will probably be put on the witness stand after I try to explain.

In essence, within a particular elementary school system, those children who are determined eligible, based on need, receive a free or reduced price lunch and all other students are charged a price based on the cost of the lunch to the school system.

In other words, lunches made available to the entire school; some students getting it free; some at a reduced price.

All Pay Same—or Free

Mr. **Hengstebeck**. I don't mind that, except again I would dislike very much charging differentiated lunch rates. This again has the effect of stigmatizing the child. There is no way you can cover that up. You know, I think, as well as I do, and anybody else knows in this room, that elementary children or small children, particularly, are not prone to reason or prone to try to understand another child's plight or condition in life. They are rather prone to comment on it aptly and candidly, and thus, you know, stigmatize, alienate, isolate, inflict a kind of continual verbal punishment on a child. I like the idea, of course, of including parental preference in a program because I think it is the right of the parents to decide whether or not their child will eat at home or in the school, but if that means that we are going to have to differentiate amounts, then I can't subscribe to that at all. Again, I would hope that however a lunch program is funded, it is funded at a level wherein a minimal but standard fee can be charged to all students so that at least the needy will be able to afford to pay the fee, or that it be for free.

Mr. **Beckham.** Free for everyone?

Mr. **Hengstebeck.** Yes, sir.

Mr. **Beckham.** You would be in favor of such a program?

Mr. **Hengstebeck.** Absolutely, yes, sir.

Mr. **Beckham.** Another question. Do you think the use of teachers during lunchtime is a profitable and valuable use of that teacher's time and abilities; and given the option of paid supervision other than teachers, whether the use of teachers is valuable or not, do you think that school lunch and feeding and nutrition, et cetera, of children should be part of the total educational program in elementary school systems?

Mr. **Hengstebeck.** I think you asked two questions.

Mr. **Beckham.** Right.

Mr. **Hengstebeck.** Let me say in the first instance I can see no particular value in the teacher supervising a lunch period. Oh, sure, this does provide him with an opportunity to see a child more individually than he might otherwise, but I think it is also healthy to provide a time for that child to get away from the teacher and the teacher to get away from the child. After all, they live together in the same room, the same environment for the better part of a day and they just ought to have a way to get away from one another at some point in time.

While I was answering that I forgot the second part of your question you asked.

Mr. **Beckham.** The involvement of the school lunch or nutritional needs of children.

HUNGRY CHILDREN WON'T LEARN

Mr. **Hengstebeck.** It is a necessary part of the program. Hungry kids don't just work as well as those kids—well, a child's ability to learn, in short, depends on one part, his physical condition. If he is weak from hunger or in pain from hunger, he can't concentrate on the task of learning. So it is an essential ingredient.

Again, you know, some people say, you know, the business of the schools is to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, the other things are frills, the first thing it is lunch, so then it is breakfast and lunch, and when are we going to have to feed them dinner, I suppose next we will put them to bed, et cetera, et cetera. I don't see that kind of argument as being especially valid. The plain point of fact is that a child who is hungry, who must endure the strain of a schoolday, and it is a strain because constantly demands are being placed on your mentality, must be equipped to meet that challenge. He can't do it if he is hungry.

Mr. **Kinney**. I am glad to see you address yourself to the Senate aspect of this issue, pointing out the need to have some kind of facility for students to take their lunch and also be removed from that same facility during the classroom period. As a former bacteriologist, I know how this particular thing can be a hindrance. There are various germs that kids might carry in a certain period, during the warmer months, winter, what have you, and Mr. Smith testified that sometimes his were rendered in the gymnasium. I think we all would agree that is not very healthy to have a lunch after a bunch of sweaty individuals have had their athletic class and then lunch. Also, I think you would probably be aware of the fact that the atmosphere of a particular feeding facility would have some effect on how acceptable that particular meal would be. They have done all kinds of tests to say color schemes have an effect on how well a person functions in executive roles. I think the same effect would apply to students.

Let me ask you a question here. You mentioned the fact you thought it was necessary for the teacher to get away from the student for a short period of time. Would you say it would be safe to say that this would be a nutritional value to the student and the teacher, to have an opportunity to have a relaxed atmosphere during a lunch break? Do you think that teacher might function better if she had a nutritional diet at that particular time?

Mr. **Hengstebeck**. I guess I am running the risk of entering into the medical profession now by commenting in an area of which I am really not prepared. I can speak as an individual. I know I don't eat well under duress; I suffer indigestion for the balance of the day, if that has been the case. I guess I don't chew my food as well, gulp it down, you know. I guess I am putting this in very simple terms, but I don't know how else to react to the question. If I have to try to eat lunch or watch other people eat lunch and watch out for their behavior and things, that kind of thing, I think what you are suggesting is that there may be something self-defeating in that and I would agree with you.

Need Professionals To Supervise

Mr. **Kinney**. Which points up further the need to have professional people who are able to participate in this kind of program, trained on site to run the program and supervise the lunch program at the particular time?

Mr. **Hengstebeck**. Yes, sir, absolutely.

Mr. **Kinney**. You also pointed out the fact there are some points in time when consideration was being given to implementing the school lunch program that there was some questions about the kind of fees to be charged, to whom, and to what kind of a person. One other point you talked about was how the fees were to be established, collected. How are the present fees collected as to the time period when a parent receives his check, welfare check, or what have you?

Mr. **Hengstebeck**. I can't really answer that question. There are others here who certainly could. I personally have not had the opportunity to administer or see administered a lunch program along the lines that we are describing here today.

The problem of collecting money, though it may seem trivial in the eyes of a lot of people is, in fact, a major problem. I can very briefly, and that is all I want to do, very briefly, relate to you that there have been previous experiences with lunch programs here in the Lansing School District and in the problem of collecting money, that is assuring the child gets the money to the school in the first place, the problem of how much instructional time is going to be taken away as a result of having to collect money, the problem of who takes time administratively to handle the money, and all of these things make the problem of money a very large one. It seems like a petty detail, but every time you undertake that kind of task you are detracting from someone else's time who is essentially an educator, not an administrator. This points up the need for some type of qualified, dedicated assistance.

Mr. Kinney. I was trying to point out the difference in some various income categories. a person who works month to month will have no money on the day-to-day basis, they receive their check on the 1st of the month and that is taken into consideration to determine when the money will be collected. Then you will find a kid who shows on the record that he only qualifies for a reduced rate but nobody has taken into consideration that his parents don't have the ability to budget the money to the point he can come every day.

Mr. Hengstebeck. I agree with what you are saying. Again I guess ideally and the best means is to either feed kids for free or provide a fee system that is so minimal by way of amount and easy to handle by way of payment that you avoid all those kinds of things. But again this implies a large level of funding. You are going to have to have it.

Mr. Kinney. Thank you.

Senator Hart. We are not debating this, either, I am just trying to check. You say that the child who suffers because he is hungry is a poor learner?

Mr. Hengstebeck. No, sir; he cannot learn.

Senator Hart. He cannot learn. How does a teacher identify that child?

Obvious Signs of Nutrition Deficiency

Mr. Hengstebeck. I guess there are obvious signs that the child would display in the classroom. The child who continually falls asleep during the course of the day, day after day, the child whose physique appears weak and palid, there are a host, I guess, of surface indications that might lead a teacher to conclude one of this child's problems is nutrition, if it occurs day in and day out, as much as any parent would detect the same kind of thing, I guess.

I have to confess that in a way, I guess, Senator, you are putting me on the spot. I am a secondary teacher, not an elementary teacher. But as a parent and one who has studied some on kids' behavior, I guess I have to speak from that basis and say if I see a kid in my classroom who every day goes to sleep, who frequently is absent with illness, whose nose is continually running, whose demeanor is lassitudical, whose color is poor, I guess I had better start making some checks with a counsellor or principal or going to visit the home to try to ascertain the reasons why.

Senator **Hart**. I think that is a completely satisfactory answer. I have a large family and I think they are well nourished. The performance of some academically is unsatisfactory, or on occasion it is. I guess I was asking you whether as a teacher you were making the judgment about a probably malnourished case based on his classroom performance, or whether, as you say, he fell asleep.

Mr. **Hengstebeck**. No; I guess there are certain signs, I think, which you can ascertain and begin to raise questions in your own mind what to do with those things. Beyond that point I don't think you can make an automatic assumption that the child is not performing well in class, therefore he is undernourished. Maybe what we need to talk about are more kinds of supportive services for schools in this instance. For example, here in Lansing, the millage, we stand to lose our school nurse whose responsibility it is, in the main, to handle these kind of teacher references. Maybe a part of another item by which to gage the level of funding needed is to talk some about the need to include school nurses, or whatever you care to call them, in other words supportive personnel, through which we can help define or identify those kids' needs who are, in fact, deprived from hunger.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you very much.

Mr. **Hengstebeck**. Thank you, Senator Hart and members of the committee. I appreciate it very much.

Senator **Hart**. It has been suggested that we depart from the list in calling our next witness.

Let's call Mr. James Kitson, the director of food services for the Lansing school system. I think he could help at this point in the record immediately following Mr. Hengstebeck to give us some additional history of the Lansing School District.

STATEMENT OF E. JAMES KITSON, DIRECTOR, FOOD SERVICES, LANSING SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. **Kitson**. Good afternoon, Senator Hart and the committee. I am most happy to be here.

Do you all have a copy of my report?

Senator **Hart**. Yes; we do.

On May 28, 1970, Dr. Stephen Partington, Superintendent of the Lansing School District, was advised that Public Law 91–248 had been signed into law by President Nixon. This law amends the National School Lunch Act of 1948 and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. It also establishes specific guidelines and expands the required policy statement of 1968.

Further, the necessary policy changes were drafted and submitted to the superintendent's office for administrative review and submission to the board of education for their consideration and was ultimately approved on November 3, 1970, as Lansing School District Policy No. 5143.1.

Concurrently, a committee appointed by the superintendent, ad hoc committee on school lunch program, worked with administrators, teachers, model cities staff, and lay citizens to develop plans for a demonstration program in the model cities area. This program was submitted to the board of education on December 11, 1970. It was decided on March 12, 1971, to postpone the program. A pilot program is still under consideration for the fall of 1971.

The food service department is staffed with people who have the administrative, management, and technical ability needed to prepare quality food for mass feeding. They also have the necessary expertise for packaging, distributing, and serving of meals. The registered dieticians, Mrs. Mary Ann Lemay and Mrs. Caroline Miller, write the menus to the type A luncheon pattern. The present kitchens are large enough to produce food for a demonstration program up to 16 schools. Beyond this number, additional physical facilities would be required.

At the present time the program is limited to the secondary schools. Only 12,345 students or 41 percent of the total school district enrollment is given the opportunity to participate in the lunch program. Of the eligible students an average 30.2 percent of 4,029 participate in the type A lunchroom program daily. Equally important is the 8.6 percent or 1,145 students approved for free meals, of which only 648 or 56.6 percent participate every day. This means 497 or 43.4 percent do not participate daily.

The breakfast program is being offered in 30 elementary buildings at the present time. The daily participation is 3,784, or 19.9 percent of the elementary enrollment.

Another situation has arisen with the increasing costs to produce the meal. As costs go up, lunch costs have been increased to a current price of 45 cents. Undoubtedly this cost has eliminated some students from participating as they do not have the full price, and they do not qualify as needy, as provided in the U.S. Department of Agriculture guidelines.

As the board of education is asked to continue and expand food services to all needy children, it is imperative that a higher level of funding be provided to meet the maximum reimbursement level allowed in the law. At the present rate of 7 cents for all type A meals and 30 cents for the needy, each free meal is a net loss of 15 cents, which must be absorbed by the program. Further, guidelines should be issued to the local districts as to the levels of participation they must obtain to receive the maximum reimbursement rate.

PROBLEMS WILL CONTINUE UNTIL ALL RECEIVE FREE FOOD

In closing, I believe that the problems in school lunch programs will continue until such time as all children receive a free nutritious luncheon as part of their normal schoolday education.

There is one comment, Mr. Hengstebeck, Mr. Stephan, excuse me, commented about the elementary program. We are serving a partial program for special education only.

Senator **HART**. I am sorry, I missed that reaction.

Mr. **KITSON**. We are serving a small group in two elementary buildings, the special education, which qualify elementary programs.

Senator **HART**. Is there any feeding facility in the Walnut Street School?

Mr. **Kitson**. Yes; we have a small production kitchen in the building.

Senator **Hart**. Which was added recently or has it always been there?

Mr. **Kitson**. It has always been there.

Senator **Hart**. Your message is sort of clear that the only cure for the myriad of problems, including the apparent substantial number of children who are from families so poor they qualify for free meals and aren't getting them, the only cure to that is money?

Mr. **Kitson**. That is true partially, but also we have not done a study to correlate the number of children who do not participate and who are not in school on any given day. We think there is an intended pattern here along with participating with the meal and participating in school activities.

Senator **Hart**. Of the 4,000 children who participate in the type A lunch program daily, you say 8.6 percent are for free meals, only 648 of those participate each day, almost half are not participating daily. You say you don't know how much absenteeism is a factor in that?

Mr. **Kitson**. That is correct.

Senator **Hart**. Would it be as much as half?

Mr. **Kitson**. I don't know.

Senator **Hart**. Would you go so far as to say you would be surprised if it were half?

Mr. **Kitson**. I have no knowledge of the attendance figures.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. **Cassidy**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The reduced price lunch costs 30 cents, is that right?

Mr. **Kitson**. No, 20 cents.

Mr. **Cassidy**. 20 cents. On the last page of your statement you indicate the reimbursement rate of 7 cents for all type A lunches and 30 cents for the needy. I believe you can get up to 12 cents reimbursement for a reduced price lunch now in section 4, isn't that correct?

Mr. **Kitson**. That is correct if we are feeding elementary children, but as long as you are not feeding elementary children it is limited to 7 cents.

Mr. **Cassidy**. Where did that meaning come to you from?

Mr. **Kitson**. This is in answer to my letter to the State office.

Mr. **Cassidy**. Would you submit that for the record?*

Mr. **Kitson**. Yes.

Mr. **Cassidy**. Thank you.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. **Beckham**. No questions.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. **Kinney**. No questions.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you very much.

Mr. **Kitson**. Yes, sir.

Senator **Hart**. Our next scheduled witness is the president of the Lansing Association of School Administrators, Mr. Ed Spink.

---

*See Appendix 1, pp. 1496, 1497.

88

STATEMENT OF EDWARD T. SPINK, PRINCIPAL, NORTH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, LANSING

Mr. **Spink.** Senator Hart, members of the committee:

It is a pleasure to speak with you today.

My comments before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs are my own and do not represent the official position of any group. My comments and concerns grow out of my experiences as a principal with school lunch programs over a period of 4 years, and from my work with the ad hoc committee on school lunches.

With community support a properly designed, funded, and staffed noon program can be administered by the elementary principal. This added responsibility must not detract from the primary role of the principal as instructional leader.

Additional Staff Needed

To insure that a noon program does not interefere with the educational responsibilities of the school nor adversely affect the role of the principal, additional staff will be needed:

(1) A professional staff person, or persons, other than the principal, to be on duty during the noon program;

(2) Sufficient trained aides to provide a suitable quality of supervision (up to one per classroom unit);

(3) Clerical help to collect money from pupils, prepare lunch tickets or lists of pupils buying lunch, maintain records for free or reduced-pay lunches, handle bookkeeping for lost or forgotten money, establish lunch count for meals to be served, figure credit due for lunches not eaten, serve as school secretary during the lunch hour of the secretary;

(4) Food service personnel to prepare or handle meals, prepare reports, clean the eating and serving areas, and perform other tasks assigned by the food service department;

(5) Additional custodial help may be needed for setting up the lunchroom, handling deliveries, handling waste and cleaning the eating and serving areas.

Proper space and facilities must be provided for both eating and other activities, particularly during inclement weather.

Additional equipment would be needed in most buildings for serving of lunches. Storage space will be needed for this equipment when not in use.

In most situations new methods of waste disposal which meet local codes will be needed.

The noon program must not cause the loss of instructional time from the classroom, require additional clerical duties by teachers, or create situations and conditions which later deter from the learning process.

The length of the noon hour should be as short as practicable. However, a short noon period has the effect of creating a closed lunch period if the time period precludes any student going home for lunch. A closed lunch program also creates a concern for the kindergarten pupil who then travels from or to school at noon without older students traveling at the same time. The schoolday may need to be shortened when pupils remain at school through the lunch hour. I question if pupils can effectively maintain the 5½-hour schoolday.

Any noon program should be open to all pupils. Students should have the option of bringing their own lunch. It is extremely difficult to administer a lunch program open to only a part of the student body.

A duty-free lunch period is needed by all employees of the school to insure an effective learning situation during the afternoon session. This may be accomplished by adjusting schedules or providing additional personnel. Responsibilities of most employees during a noon period are a negotiable item under Michigan law.

The noon program must be designed, staffed, and funded to allow the principal to function as an educational leader in the school in which he serves.

Senator Hart. I haven't any idea how much it would cost to provide the additional staff to insure the adequate space and facilities to obtain the equipment to operate in the fashion you described. You say with community support a staffed noon program of the character you described can be administered by an elementary school principal. Do you believe that the benefits obtained would justify the cost represented by the staff and the facilities?

Less Would Have Detrimental Effects

Mr. Spink. I believe that anything less than the kind of program that I have described would have detrimental effects that would outweigh any positive effects.

Senator Hart. Thank you very much.

Mr. Cassidy. I have no questions.

Mr. Beckham. No questions.

Mr. Kinney. I have one question.

In No. 3 on your second page you mention maintain records of the clerical help and what have you. How is this being handled now in the school system as to setting up when the fees should be collected?

Mr. Spink. I can best respond to that by describing the system which was used in the building where I was principal 3 years ago when we had a type A hot lunch program.

We collected on Mondays for those who were going to buy a hot lunch by the week. At that time the cost was 35 cents. So they bought a ticket or bought their hot lunch for a week. We have found that collecting on Friday was not satisfactory. Most families had money available on Monday if they were going to have money available. We asked them if they were going to have a hot lunch for ordering the food and preparing the food, they buy it for the week, so we knew how much food to prepare. If a child was absent on Monday, we did allow him to buy Tuesday for the remainder of the week or whenever he came back from his absence. It is the practice in some school districts if you miss the collection you can't have a hot lunch for the rest of the week. So we did this on Monday.

For those students buying milk, because it was a lesser amount and easier to store the milk, we encouraged buying milk with a cold lunch for the milk but did allow daily money, but that brings into the problem of the lost and the forgotten money, because four pennies by noon become three pennies and if left on the bus on the seat, this kind of thing.

Mr. **Kinney**. My next question will address itself to that. You recommended people to keep records of forgotten lunch money or lost money. My question is would you waive that cost?

Mr. **Spink**. There would be no way to waive that cost.

Mr. **Kinney**. You would have to be assessed later?

Pay Cash or Don't Eat

Mr. **Spink**. There is no way to do it. You either pay cash for the lunch under the school program or you don't eat. The school department has cash or you don't eat. That means out of my pocket or somebody else's in order for him to eat. I had a compassionate P.T.A. who gave me a revolving fund and I had to lend and keep the money for the student so he could pay for his lunch, because there is no way for me to give a lunch for just a forgotten lunch, and that year the records I kept showed I loaned $195 during the course of the year.

Mr. **Kinney**. It looks like we need some mechanism for some kind of loan program to provide substitutes.

Mr. **Spink**. At least some interest.

Mr. **Kinney**. You know, here comes a kid who might be a reduced price lunch and perhaps he says he left his money but that day the parent didn't have the reduced price and to save embassassment, he just tells a little story. He doesn't like to say his parent didn't have the money, kind of embarrassing. Say a parent didn't have 25 cents or 15 cents, it isn't too easy to say that. So here comes a kid and he does without a lunch.

One other question. I know when I was growing up the availability of school facilities were impossible to come by for recreation or anything after school hours that wasn't part of a particular program. Your recommendations recommended the choice to bring a lunch if a parent decided or if a kid chose to do so. Would a kid who brought his lunch be allowed to use the facility to partake of his meal or would he have to sit around the halls or go outside?

Mr. **Spink**. I would suggest that he be given the same type of supervision and be provided the same facilities as the student who buys the lunch. There is no way to differentiate between the two in providing that type of service in my mind if that is what the community and the government except of the schools, so I would say the same service that is available to both. My experience was that at least half chose to bring their lunch over participating in the hot lunch program.

Mr. **Kinney**. Thank you.

Senator **Hart**. The school that you were in where you had this experience 3 years ago, was it a junior high school?

Mr. **Spink**. Elementary.

Senator **Hart**. Elementary. A high percentage of the children from families that would be entitled to a reduced or low priced lunch?

Mr. **Spink**. A low percentage.

Senator **Hart**. A low percentage.

Mr. **Beckham**. Why was the program discontinued? Why did they stop the lunch program?

Mr. **Spink**. The supervision costs were borne entirely by the local school district. The level of staffing the noon program was very unsatisfactory, causing many problems. In order to bring that staffing up to a desirable level would have cost considerable money and at that time we faced an earlier millage defeat and all such costs were cut out of the budget and therefore the noon program was not continued. The students in this area are bussed home now for their meal at home and then brought back to school.

Mr. **Beckham**. What is the cost that is involved in the busing operation as it relates particularly to the cost of the supervision at lunchtime with the lunch program?

Mr. **Spink**. I believe it is considerably less to bus the children home, it was at that time, and I believe it still to be considerably less.

Mr. **Beckham**. Am I correct that one of the problems, one of the controversies involved in the recent discussion in the lunch program at Lansing was the projected cost at the level of help that you are suggesting they would have to have? The dollar figure placed on that was pretty steep, if I remember right.

Mr. **Spink**. That is correct.

Mr. **Beckham**. And it brought about a negative reaction for those responsible for voting such money, am I right?

Mr. **Spink**. Well, it brought a negative reaction.

Mr. **Beckham**. Yes.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you very much.

The area principal of Horsebrook School, Mrs. Olivia Letts. I should add, it is important, she is cochairman of ad hoc committee on school lunch program.

STATEMENT OF MRS. OLIVIA LETTS, AREA PRINCIPAL, LANSING PUBLIC SCHOOLS, COCHAIRMAN OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM, HORSEBROOK SCHOOL

Mrs. **Letts**. Thank you for the opportunity to appear.

The Lansing Elementary School personnel, with money from Model Cities, was ready to implement a hot lunch program in select buildings this spring.

Some parents were most unhappy that time would be taken from instruction, the use of the gym would be curtailed, and time of school staff would be needed. They felt that lunch was a home responsibility which school should not assume. The school district was, at that time, asking the voters for millage and the lunch issue was engendering negative feelings on the part of some adults in the community so the plan was tabled.

Lansing has done such a good job of integrating many of its schools that it is difficult to establish any program for the low income families without segregating youngsters. Programs in the schools, not open to all children who have the need, cause grave concern to the neighborhood parents. This, in turn, affects their attitude toward these youngsters.

The Lansing teachers' contract spells out the teachers' day, contact hours, and a duty-free lunch period. The teachers and their organization worked with administrators to formulate a pilot plan. I feel sure that some guidelines about elementary teachers and lunch responsibility, or no responsibility, will be a part of the new master agreement.

Principals need lunch and time to eat it. In order that their time to be an instructional leader is not decreased, their lunch period should not be during the instructional hours of the day. Lansing administrators have a formal bargaining unit recognized by the board of education. I am sure that they will request a duty-free lunch hour.

Since the same buses are used for transporting elementary and secondary students, it has been necessary to have staggered opening and dismissal schedules. Changing the lunch hour would affect the closing time and thus require more buses. Financially this is not possible.

Before implementing a lunch program, consideration must be given to the following:

(1) Assume that a building not built with lunchroom facilities will have different needs from a building with these facilities. Whatever these needs, they must be met;

(2) Adequate staffing. This means one supervisor for each 30 children and enough personnel to handle the program;

(3) Provisions for rainy days;

(4) Equipment conducive to mass feeding;

(5) Lunch reasonably priced for those who are not needy, with provision for someone to collect the money and keep the records;

(6) The lunch period must be long enough for some to go home, but not too long for those who are eating in school. Forty-five minutes probably approaches the happy medium.

Reading, writing, and arithmetic have had top priority in the schools. If we are to add nutritional needs of youngsters to the list, funds are needed.

Lansing is an urban school district faced with many problems. Though we believe that hungry children must be fed, we know that the taxpayer feels he cannot take on this task.

If the Federal Government feels strongly enough about the school lunch program to make these new guidelines, it must support its position with full funding. The local taxpayer is not willing to foot the bill.

Senator **Hart**. Let me clear up the last couple of sentences here. We would be in agreement. You say in the next to the last paragraph that "Lansing is an urban school district faced with many problems. Though we believe that hungry children must be fed, we know that the taxpayer feels he cannot take on this task." You mean the local taxpayer?

Mrs. **Letts**. Yes; I am sorry, I meant the local taxpayer.

Senator **Hart**. So take it on indirect.

Mrs. **Letts**. I suppose they do have the options for the indirect that they don't for the direct.

Senator **Hart**. I don't want to be charged later with having, even by silence, indicated I think money came from anybody but the taxpayers, I don't care who the collector is.

Do We Feed Hungry Children?

That gets us to the basic problem. If there are hungry children, do we agree we should feed them as a people? And I would hope the answer is yes, and I am sure it is. We just get hung up with the frustrations of the program that seems unable to meet it, and while we argue about the program, improvement, redirection, and so on, we tend to forget that the hungry children aren't getting fed. Now, maybe that oversimplifies and overemotionalizes, but I am just sure that we are not kidding ourselves that there are children in this incredibly rich land, as an earlier witness described, who fall asleep regularly in the classroom because they are hungry, not being fed. So long as there is such a child, then we have failed our responsibilities. The purpose of this meeting, and others, is to find out how we respond to that, and your counsel is helpful.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. **Cassidy.** I have no questions.

Senator **Hart.** Mr. Beckham.

Mr. **Beckham.** I have one question and you may not be the person to answer it. The cost of busing versus the cost of lunchroom supervision, in all fairness I am eliminating the cost of the lunchroom program as to the food, just the supervision. Would it be your opinion that busing is a less expensive operation than supervision at the lunchroom during the school period?

Mrs. **Letts.** Let me say I am not the appropriate person to answer that question, but may I also add, in order to integrate, Lansing is busing all over so far as our needs are to be met in that area. This will be done, it has priority to do certain things, and now we are being asked to add a new priority.

Would Lunch Program Affect Busing?

Mr. **Beckham.** Because you do all busing, how would that affect or how would a school lunch program affect the busing operation?

Mrs. **Letts.** Well, the teachers have the children for 5½ hours contact time. We have an hour and a half in the elementary schools for lunch. This allows him to walk a good distance. All right. Most of us agree in the planning stages that that was much too long a period for children to be with a teacher to eat a lunch. They have said it takes less than 10 minutes to do that. So in order to retain these children in a freer atmosphere for an hour and a half would just be almost insurmountable, so we decided we would have to shorten the period. If we do this, then we are shortening the period for the closing of the school day.

What I meant by staggering the hours, our junior and senior high schools use the same buses and our children in elementary, by having a long lunch hour, are able to wait for the buses because they are still in school. If we cut this time down, we then have just compounded the number of children using those same buses, and, of course, we have increased the expense. So that is how there is the effect. The time period does this.

Mr. **Beckham.** So a school lunch program would have an adverse effect on the busing plan as presently constituted?

Mrs. **Letts**. Yes, as it is presently. I am sure it could be worked out, but it is a problem.

Mr. **Beckham**. OK. Thank you.

Mr. **Kinney**. Mrs. Letts, in your statement you state here, "Lansing has done such a good job of integrating many of their schools that it is difficult to establish any program for the low income families without segregating youngsters." Then you go on to talk about the attitudes and how it affects the general public. And over further you point out, "Reading, writing, and arithmetic have had top priority in the schools. If we are to add nutritional needs of youngsters to the list, funds are needed."

Mrs. **Letts**. Yes.

Mr. **Kinney**. I guess I would like to stay with this particular line of thinking. Presently what is in your curriculum that deals with the nutritional needs from an educational standpoint for children in elementary schools?

Mrs. **Letts**. You mean deal with nutrition?

Mr. **Kinney**. Yes; with instruction. I know we need to feed children and I am still concerned about what we need to have children understand the reason to be fed with a nutritional diet. Now, if we are going to provide funds for the food, then what kind of revamping do we need to provide the educational opportunity for this particular instance?

Mrs. **Letts**. At present there is a person on the staff of the school system called home and family living consultant. Certainly the one person is not able to do the kind of thing that we probably would want if you are going to really make it a full instructional program. But this person, with additional staff, I am sure, as far as being able to give teachers guidelines, this is possible. Now, how we really fit it in and call it a separate subject would be a question that I couldn't answer. It seems to me as though if we are talking about calling that instruction, then it ought to be incorporated in some other subject areas.

Mr. **Kinney**. Do you have a health program now? Do you teach health?

Mrs. **Letts**. We call it physical education. The health is not a certain period every day, the physical ed incorporates health into its program. Each teacher, of course, is almost a unit unto herself. I am sure some might do a better job than others might.

Mr. **Kinney**. It seems to me this is one subject with regards to the level of income or poverty you could deal with without having to point out any particular group. I mean, you know, it seems to me like this is one you wouldn't have to incorporate based upon where I came from as to whether I need food.

Mrs. **Letts**. No argument from me.

Mr. **Kinney**. I think you kind of point out here in your statement, to some extent, where as we achieve a certain degree of numbers of people in integrating schools, we still have an internal segregation that is more devastating than a separate school system.

Mrs. **Letts**. May I respond to that?

Mr. **Kinney**. Yes.

FEDERAL GUIDELINES CREATE SEGREGATION

Mrs. **LETTS**. I feel the first part of what I said as far as integrating, I really feel Lansing, I wouldn't say it if I didn't think it, I don't have any fear of not saying it, I was with the school system when I was the only black one there, so I have been with it for 20 years and I can speak with authority on the subject, I feel Lansing has done a good job of trying to get these youngsters into the school. They have a Federal program of trying to work with teachers to make sure teachers understand how to work with youngsters. They are busing youngsters where they do not live in the neighborhood. So they are making these kinds of efforts. They still have neighbors and the children still have the youngsters who live in the neighborhoods. They come from homes with varying attitudes. All these things are being worked on. But when you bring a program into the school, call it remedial reading or any kind of thing, and you are saying that unless this child's family makes a certain income he can't participate. So that you are really telling the next-door neighbor who might also have a child with a problem that you can't participate because you make too much money. We are creating some problems. This does happen. In the Followthrough program which is another program, we do things that really segregate the youngsters to follow Federal guidelines. I am saying that Lansing, it seems to me, is doing, maybe not its best, but certainly a more concentrated effort, and I don't think, frankly, they have gotten the kind of credit that we read about a place that has a difficult time. I think the effort has been honest.

I am saying, fine, we will take on nutrition and no argument. We want to do it right. The teachers have bent over backwards, and it could really have been a very difficult relationship. We worked with model cities, they went with me to numerous meetings, we were all working together on this, model cities, time and time again they asked us for new guidelines, and we had the program all worked through. So we are doing some things. We are only saying give us the money when you ask us to do something new.

Mr. **KINNEY**. You are saying that the same concentrated effort that you have undergone to bring about these various changes which you refer to could certainly become a reality providing you had the same emphasis and the staff and funds for nutritional education, and that is the point I am trying to make, that if we are going to do anything about the problem we have to bring educational concept along with the tangible concept of the food itself. I am saying let's not go down the road 10 years from today and back up and see where we failed everybody as to the need to educate them as a need for this food. That is what I was trying to get into. We have recognized the need to provide this additional support with facilities, the sensitive training, or what have you, to bring about these understandings that are necessary, for the same kind of understanding needs to take place in the area of food and nutrition.

Mrs. **LETTS**. Thank you.

Mr. **BECKHAM**. One question. I remember now the ad hoc committee took a trip to Grand Rapids to view that school lunch program from the point of view of it being a new program and Lansing being interested in starting the same thing. What were some of the general impressions of that committee as it relates to what you are trying to do in Lansing? What are some of the impressions you have?

Another Responsibility Added to Principals

Mrs. **Letts**. I am hesitating because I want to be sure the remarks I make in regard to my trip to Grand Rapids are not in any way embarrassing, because I think it is wonderful for them to have us. The main impression I got, gee whiz, here was another responsibility added to principals without taking into consideration that something would have to give. I don't believe Grand Rapids has a formal negotiating unit. All right, so you could not do that kind of thing. I do feel that they certainly had some fine custodial staff in some of the buildings because this was another custodial task, especially buildings that didn't have facilities and they had to lower the tables from the wall and then had to raise them again. And certainly they also had some real fine supervision in some schools. The school where I visited, one of the supervisors worked with the children during the course of the day, perhaps more than one, so that these were adults they had contact with more than an hour, which is very important. And I was impressed by this because it is very difficult to have an outsider come in and work for an hour and to gain rapport with the youngsters in a free atmosphere like lunch unless he also has had time to know that youngster and the youngster know him doing some other activities.

Mr. **Beckham**. Do you feel it increased or diminished the impetus of the committee to press on for the school lunch program in Lansing elementary schools?

Mrs. **Letts**. I really don't think that really had any point. We were only trying to find out the best way. From the very first we assumed that lunch was coming, we just wanted to have the very best program we could, and we are saying whatever the responsibility, be sure the level of funding is such that it can be the very best program possible.

Mr. **Beckham**. So it didn't dampen your spirits, what you saw was not such that it dampened your spirits towards reaching your goal?

Mrs. **Letts**. I really don't wish to comment on the program any further.

Mr. **Beckham**. OK.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you very much.

Mrs. **Letts**. You are welcome.

Senator **Hart**. Departing from the schedule I wonder if the superintendent here in the Lansing system, Mr. Steve Partington, and Mr. Rosa would like to come up. I note Mr. Rosa was here but I think he left.

I see you have sort of a carefully worded disclaimer on the front here.

Mr. **Partington**. That is your choice of words, sir, and I think——

Senator **Hart**. Clarifying introductory note.

Mr. **Partington.** Yes, sir. I think what we are saying is there are differences of opinion among the nine members that comprise the school board in Lansing, and I have tried very hard to put together what I felt represented the consensus of the majority of this group. The president of the board was seated beside me until just moments ago and had to leave and I am sorry for that.

Senator **Hart.** Please apologize for me, too. I noticed him leave and that is why I thought I would call you before you left, too.

Mr. **Partington.** Well, thank you. Mr. Rosa authorized me to say that he felt the majority of the board agreed wholeheartedly with what it was I had to say.

May I read the statement?

Senator **Hart.** Yes, please.

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN A. PARTINGTON, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, LANSING SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. **Partington.** The critical question in the lunch program, as it now stands, is adequate financing. School districts throughout the Nation are reaching the point where serious cutbacks in program are a near certainty unless massive new financing becomes a reality.

The greatest new cost to the local district in this program will be that of supervision. Children must be adequately supervised. Additional problems include the need for more clerical time for handling funds, schedules, and routine matters on a day-to-day basis. Staff in elementary schools are scheduled to the breaking point now, and should not be asked to assume more responsibility.

This program should be voluntary. Only those who want this service should be included, but it should be offered to all. Those who can bear the cost should be asked to do so, but no one should be denied the service because he cannot pay.

The program should not be supported out of local tax funds in whole or in part. These funds are badly strained now. Federal funding should take this into account.

Good food is essential for every child. He cannot learn well without it, nor will his body develop properly. In this land, where we can send men to the moon, we surely can provide for those who need good food.

I would be happy to entertain any questions that the committee or staff would like to address to me.

Senator **Hart.** In reflecting the need to blend for consensus, I think the statement very useful.

I take it there is agreement that "Good food is essential for every child. He cannot learn well without it, nor will his body develop properly." That, you say, is the point of view that is shared by the board and yourself?

Good Food Essential to Learning

Mr. **Partington.** I think there would be no question on it.

Senator **Hart.** And it would follow, and I don't mean now to ask you to respond in a way that would modify at all the statement, but let me think out loud. From that proposition it would follow that it is important for society to insure that every child have good food and to realize if there are children not getting good food they cannot learn well and they cannot develop their bodies properly?

Mr. PARTINGTON. Yes, sir, no question about that.

Senator HART. And on the assumption that there are children who do not get good food and hence are not learning well and whose bodily development is arrested we are lessening the strength of us as a people. Maybe it is the parents' fault, maybe it is somebody else's fault, but if by lecturing, if prayer, as an example, isn't good to cure the problem, then the hard, cold fact is that society, through the tax dollar, is going to have to meet the problem, isn't that right?

Mr. PARTINGTON. Yes, sir. I think as a Nation we have addressed ourselves to that same question and answered it in the affirmative, but what we are examining now, it seems to me, is what is the role of the schools.

Senator HART. What are the tools that will enable us to meet the need?

Mr. PARTINGTON. Sorry, sir; what was the question?

Senator HART. Is the school the best available role, is this program the right course, and all that; that is really it?

Mr. PARTINGTON. That is my understanding of what we are trying to do.

Senator HART. Do you have, out of the blue—is there a more appropriate instrument than the school?

Mr. PARTINGTON. Sir, I think it is possible that the answer to that question might eventually be yes. At this point in time, given the set of problems of which we have to deal in society, it is my personal opinion that I haven't a better alternative to offer. I think the genus of our society is that we are never content with a single answer to a particular question at any particular time; we are more than willing to address ourselves to that question on a continuing basis. I think as superintendent of schools I have to face the proposition that every day appearing in the buildings where my responsibility rests are young people who are not adequately fed. We hold to the proposition, rather simply stated but I submit, sir, it is a hard one to wrestle with in terms of a negative debate, we are in the business of helping children to learn well and we are in the business of trying to deal with young people whose bodies are developing appropriately, our total education turns on these two points, not exclusively, but heavily, and we simply can't stand aside and say, "I am sorry we have no solution to the problem so let's go on to something else."

Senator HART. Can you accept a note we will continue to work on it and indicate what form the answer will take eventually rather than through the school?

Mr. PARTINGTON. Well, I have a great hope, I guess, sir, as everyone does, I think one of the genera of a democratic society is building a strong family. I think any proposition that is put forward that doesn't have as one of its goals, in this area, now, the building of essential and strong families is probably not serving us well. So I would argue a direction that we must not lose is, in our society, trying to do everything that the Creator and well-meaning people can do to build stronger families, and I suspect that this is one of the things in the period of history in which you and I have responsibility, we may not be doing as well as we wished.

Senator Hart. Of course it is a chicken-egg thing in a certain aspect, our family units atrophying because there isn't income or would it follow each if they had minimum adequate income that they would still atrophy?

Responses of Persons Vary

Mr. Partington. Sir, I respectfully suggest that the abilities of people to respond well to given situations, one where we are talking about nutrition as was being earlier mentioned, that people's ability to respond vary so widely, and that in a free society we are caught between how much direction do we give, however well meant, to people, who are adults and are functioning members of our society, and on the other hand, how much of what the result of failure to perform can we stand in our society, and I think this is the point, the two points between which we stand, and we in education of course feel very strongly that the role of education has something very essential to offer us right here.

Senator Hart. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I agree it is essential for us to reinforce the family structure as society attempts to alleviate poverty. I think, though, it is not so much poverty, per se, which contributes to the breakdown of the American family, especially the poor family, as it is frequently our misguided attempts to alleviate poverty, such as, for example, the man-in-the-house rule as exists in the ADC program. In addition to reinforcing the family unit, don't you agree that the school is the most logical place to address ourselves specifically to delivering food to children, doesn't it serve as possibly the best and most viable delivery service at the noon hour?

Mr. Partington. I am an old debater and I am looking for your track in the question and there probably is none. Really, I think we are talking about two different things. The second question I have already answered, I think, by saying I don't know at this point in time of a better alternative. So it leaves me to answer yes to your question. The problems of poverty are so complex and so overwhelming I won't attempt at this point to try to analyze what solutions, there are better people than I in this field. I can simply stand as a responsible citizen and observe the form of tragedy and simply say I must respond and this is the most meaningful response I know how to make.

Mr. Cassidy. Thank you.

Senator Hart. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. Beckham. No questions.

Senator Hart. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. Kinney. No questions.

Senator Hart. Thank you very much. Sorry we held you so long. Turning now to our original list, Mrs. Clinton Canady of Lansing.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CLINTON CANADY, JR., MEMBER, BOARD OF EDUCATION, LANSING SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mrs. CANADY. Senator Hart and members of the committee. I am Mrs. Clinton Canady, and I am speaking as a citizen and not as a member of the board of education.

Lansing school district policy number 5143.1 provides reduced cost or free meals for students who qualify and who are enrolled in junior or senior high school.

A demonstration lunch program has been proposed for the fall of 1971 in only five elementary schools that service the Model Cities area. In November of 1970, it was estimated that 1,563 families in the Model Cities area earned less than $3,000 per year. Six hundred sixty-two family units received aid to dependent children. Those students were being bused, currently, 590 out of 2,500 other elementary black students. There were two considered all black and two or three others had a high percentage of blacks. There were 1,455 that qualify in the city for free lunches.

However, current statistics indicate that each of the 45 elementary schools in the Lansing school district has from 1 percent to 92 percent of their total enrollment represented by ADC families; 23 schools have more than 20 percent. If one included percentages of Lansing's marginal and low-income families, and families with both parents employed, the economic need for elementary school lunch programs would be evident. Recent studies have indicated that good nutrition is directly related to the learning process and to behavioral problems. Poor nutritional habits are not limited to families with low income.

RESISTANCE TO EXPANSION OF LUNCH PROGRAM

Yet, there is documented resistance to expanding the lunch program to include elementary schools. It is hoped that this committee will identify and address itself to some of the concerns expressed by this resistance.

To identify a few:

1. The cost of supervision and equipment to expand Public Law 91-248 (which amends the National School Lunch Act of 1948 and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966) to service elementary schools in districts like Lansing without elementary lunch school facilities.

2. Provisions to cover basic costs of installation and supervision for those students who can afford to pay the actual cost of lunch or who may pay a reduced cost.

This provision would avoid identifying certain students as "needy" by offering lunch to all students in the school. The same argument for discrimination exists when a few "selected" schools in a district offer elementary lunch programs and others do not.

3. Elementary school lunch programs are only expanded welfare programs and are evidence of "creeping socialism."

Few advocates of lunch programs stress the more flexible scheduling, the shorter schoolday, the impact of improved nutrition on the learning process and behavioral patterns, and the other benefits that are the positive and proven results that may be gained.

4. Dollars from the school budget spent for lunch programs might better be applied to educational programs.

To a teacher, this might mean reduced class sizes.

To a principal, with a reduced staff, it might mean additional personnel.

To an administrator, it might mean an additional principal for schools currently sharing one principal on a part-time basis.

To a board of education, that has lost repeated millage attempts, it might mean all of these things and others that have been cut from the educational program.

Educators and the general public are reluctant to recognize nutrition as a responsibility of the educational system despite the fact that many students are denied the opportunity to learn because they are hungry.

5. One of the hidden concerns, seldom expressed, is related to the neighborhood school concept. Some citizens equate lunch programs with busing.

Currently some children from innercity areas are bused four times a day to accommodate both token desegregation and the neighborhood school concept. Obviously the job of desegregating schools in Lansing is less difficult, if busing schedules can be reduced. Consequently, some persons view the expansion and development of lunch programs as a direct threat to the neighborhood school.

This point needs to be examined as crucial in the determination of the purpose and direction of public schools in Michigan. Are public schools to offer equality of opportunity for all students or are they designed for the affluent few?

Senator HART. On that last point, would you expand it so I am more comfortable in believing I understand how that argument goes?

BUSING PROBLEM TIED TO NUTRITION

Mrs. CANADY. Currently there are about 590 students bused to, oh, some maybe 15 elementary schools and they come from the center city or what is termed often innercity of Lansing. Now, there are about 2,500 black students in the system so we are talking about 500 of 2,500 or more elementary school students who are bused for purposes of racial integration. Now, that is a very small number when you consider that there are two elementary schools that might be considered all black elementary schools. There are two that, maybe even three that are pretty close to being predominantly black. If the board of education wanted to pursue the policy of racial integration completely and bused white students, for instance, into the innercity to have equal racial balance, certainly a lunch program would make that plan more feasible. Don't misunderstand me, I am not saying that the board has considered this, but this is just my personal opinion and I am sure this is a factor in the resistance that many people have against lunch programs.

Senator HART. You have not seen it in print or circulated in pamphlet form, just feel because it would make sense, make easier such cross busing——

Mrs. CANADY. Well, I have seen the resistance to the busing, I have heard it documented and it has been said many times as a matter of record, there was extreme resistance to busing.

Senator Hart. I am sure of that.

Mrs. Canady. So I am equating the lunch program, at least one of the points in resistance in the lunch program to that same type of sentiment that is present.

Senator Hart. The membership on the board of education here is appointed or elected?

Mrs. Canady. It is an elective board.

Senator Hart. By district?

Mrs. Canady. City-at-large.

Senator Hart. City-at-large.

Mrs. Canady. That is probably the end of my tenure.

Senator Hart. I don't think many voters will read the transcript. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy. No questions, thank you.

Senator Hart. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. Beckham. No questions, thank you.

Mr. Kinney. I don't have any questions.

Senator Hart. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Canady. Thank you for the opportunity.

STATEMENT OF VERNON EBERSOLE, LANSING

Mr. Ebersole. Gentlemen, thank you very much for the opportunity of presenting my thoughts on school lunch programs.

Much has been written about how necessary it is to have a youngster satisfied physically before he is able to learn well. I have no doubt that facts and figures will bear this out. However, there has been an extensive food program in the secondary schools for several years. Yet it is in these same schools that most of the unrest and physical damages have evolved. It appears that food programs as they are developed respond to conduct and decorum in inverse order, that is, the more youngsters that have been provided food service the more disturbances that have occurred within the schools. The recipients may be enjoying better nutrition which, in turn, is supposed to provide an opportunity for a better learning experience. However, experience nationwide, as publicized in the news media, tends to prove that the opposite is happening.

A concerted drive is underway to provide lunches in all the schools for as many students that are able to qualify under the very liberal guidelines. These lunches are provided while school is open. This includes a school year of 38 weeks, or 180 schooldays minimum in Michigan. Even this is a misnomer, since operations of the schools during the school year involve days off for parent-teacher conferences, end of semesters, illness and teachers' meetings. On top of this, interspersed throughout the school year are vacation periods of from 2 days, Thanksgiving holiday, to 2 weeks, Christmas holidays.

But let us be generous and use 180 days as a base for a school year. According to my recollection, a calendar year consists of 365 days. This leaves 185 days that the young people will be without a so-called nutritious lunch. Is it possible that the lunches provided on each of the 180 school days are so "super" that their benefits carry over to the 185 days that are left?

Gentlemen, if we really have the interests and well-being of the youngsters at heart, and we feel that the schools are the proper vehicle for insuring this well-being, then we should think in terms of turning the youngsters over to the schools 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks of the year. These "teasers" of one meal provided for less than half of the days of the year are almost a mockery.

Instead of loading the schools with extraneous services such as meals and transportation, let's allow the schools to return to educating the young people and turn our attention for these other services to the multitude of departments and organizations within the Federal and State governments. Granted, the schools leave a lot to be desired in their prime function as an education vehicle. But loading them with these extra duties is hardly the way to encourage the educational community to work to improve their product.

Thank you again for this opportunity of expressing my deep, sincere feelings to this distinguished group.

Senator **Hart**. I believe they will testify together, Mrs. George Hess and Mrs. Gilbert Smith, am I correct on this?

Mrs. **Hess**. We both have our own statements.

Senator **Hart**. Mrs. Hess.

STATEMENT OF MRS. GEORGE HESS, PRESIDENT, LEWTON PTA, LANSING

Mrs. **Hess**. As a parent I became aware of the proposed elementary hot lunch program for the Lansing School District shortly before the school board announced the need of an increase of millage from 17 to 24 mills the first time. At first, my primary objection was the use of educational money for something we didn't need. The more I thought about it the more I became convinced that it would actually be detrimental to the education of the majority of Lansing elementary school children.

Upon further investigation I have discovered:

(1) That the Federal Government will provide 75 percent of the initial equipment expense, but the local district must supply 25 percent of the cost plus the expense of depreciation and replacement.

(2) That the Federal Government is only reimbursing about one-fourth that actual cost of the qualified needy lunches now, according to the recent figures published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(3) That the Michigan State Board of Education is urging that not only breakfast and lunch be provided during the school year, but the program be extended to include three meals a day.

(4) That the Lansing School District is losing money on the 648 free lunches that were supplied in the junior and senior highs throughout the city.

(5) That in figuring the cost of the lunches the school district only figures the direct costs of the food and personnel involved in preparation of the food and the local school district must absorb the indirect cost of supervisory help, increased maintenance, depreciation, utilities, janitorial services and supplies, trash disposal, and administration.

(6) That one of the reasons the costs have increased is because they can no longer ask the children receiving free lunches to work in the lunchroom and have to hire the work done at union scale.

(7) That the shorter lunch period proposed would force the majority of children going to elementary school into the lunch program whether they or their parents wished them to or not. Even the 45-minute proposed period would prevent my child from coming home, and there are children that live even further than mine.

(8) That the children would lose the use of the all-purpose room for more than 2 hours a day.

When considering the funding of this program, where do the supplemental funds come from? The Federal regulations say from the State, but the State of Michigan is broke because of the auto strikes, increases in welfare costs, and the slowdown of the economy. The funds therefore have to come from the local property tax millage that is becoming more and more difficult to pass. A lunch program once started is even harder to phase out, so the local taxpayers would have the cost from then on. This program will place a burden on an already distressed school district. Most of the parents have heard or have observed the junior and senior high lunch program. My son will not buy his lunch in junior high because, although he is my fastest eater, by the time he buys his lunch he doesn't have time to eat it. The lunchroom is the usual place that fights start, either from cutting in line or from the intimidations and shakedowns that take place.

When the proposed lunch program came to my attention, I informed the Lansing School Board of my feelings as a parent, then as president of the Lewton Parent-Teacher Association, I compiled a survey to be sent out to the parents of the Lewton school area, with the approval of the Lewton PTA Executive Board.

Lansing School Board is asking for 24 mills. If this millage passes, and they receive adequate funds from the State, the board plans to start a school lunch program for all elementary children in all elementary schools although they cannot reinstate all the services offered in the 1969–70 year.

The Federal law states that the board must submit a plan to feed all needy children where a type A lunch program is offered or they might lose their Federal reimbursement funds and commodities they now get for the junior high and senior high lunch—about $740,000 last year. The cost of the lunch program for just the needy is estimated at $90,000 in next year's budget. The cost of the program for all the remainder of the elementary children is estimated at $400,000. The board feels they cannot open this lunch program to the needy without making it available to all children.

ADVANTAGES

1. It would provide a means of serving nutritional lunches to the needy.
2. It would provide a supervised lunch for children of working mothers.
3. It would be a convenience for mothers busy with other activities.

PROBLEMS

1. Length of lunch period, a short one would be better for the students who do stay for the lunch, but it would make it impossible for the students living one-quarter mile or more from school to go home for lunch. The present length of lunch period would make it possible for all children who wished to have lunch at home, but would increase the difficulties at school, especially on rainy days.

2. We would need some teachers to supervise, because of their authority. Is it fair to ask them to volunteer their only break in the day, even if it is for extra money?

3. Students would lose the use of the all-purpose room for about 2 hours a day. This room is used every hour now.

4. Extra aids would be hired to supervise the playground and supplement the teachers.

5. Most educators agree when there is a lunch program in the elementary, the children find it harder to concentrate in the afternoon.

6. The possibility of accidents would increase.

Yes, I would like a lunch program at Lewton School.——

No, I would not like a lunch program at Lewton School.——

COMMENTS

We would really like your opinion of this program, even if you agree or disagree. If there are any questions, please call me. 882-2734.

JOAN HESS, *President, PTA*

Mrs. HESS. Of the little more than 300 sheets sent out, there were 183 returned. Of that number, 55 were "yes" and 128 were "no." Of the parents who said "yes," 38 made no comments, 17 did. Four parents were undecided. Of the 128 "no" votes, 45 made no comments and 83 did.

The most frequently mentioned comments are—

	Yes	No
1. Felt that the money should be used for education		23
2. Children and teachers need the break		23
3. Enjoyed having their children at home at noon		16
4. Felt the cost was too high for the advantages		11
5. Were in favor of feeding the needy only	1	8
6. Saw no need to provide lunches for the needy		9
7. Mentioned the benefit of exercise at noon		6
8. Will not vote for the millage if this is included		5
9. Complained that the questionnaire was biased	2	1
10. Suggested other methods of feeding the needy	1	2
11. Think that accidents are a factor:		
would have less accidents	2	
more	1	
12. Mentioned they were, or hoped to be, working mothers	3	
13. Felt the children would get better acquainted with each other with a lunch program	2	

Excellent.

Because I wish my children only had to ride the bus twice a day. I think there would be less chance for them to have accidents in traffic.

I think lunches will be good for needy children because we mothers do have to work. Thank you very much.

I would use it as a convenience four or more times a month when appointments conflict with the lunch time schedule.

Couldn't they eat in their home rooms? It's better to have a few people taking care of the school children than having thousands of mothers having to be home at 12.

Wen we moved here it was very difficult for our children to get acquainted because there was no unstructured time in the school. Eating together and freely playing together would have helped. There is value in eating with friends, social, better eating habits and so forth.

I must say this mother has not seen a lunch program in action.

If there are pupils at Lewton who need a lunch program it definitely should be available to them. However, it should be entirely voluntary and the cost of the meal charged to all except the needy.

Yes; I would like a lunch program at Lewton School. Only if it is required by law. The maybe a more practical box-lunch program would be looked into.

The people opposed to the lunch program made the following comments:

I don't feel it's necessary for all students. It'll be a very long day for elementary-age students. They need the break. Lunches for the needy bused in, is fine.

I have heard nothing but unfavorable comments from everyone on the lunch programs now offered in junior and senior high. The whole system seems to be totally inadequate to the need, and the inefficient use of the money.

There are many, many better items to spend the tax dollar on.

The money can only go so far and there are other educational things needed. Remedial reading, et cetera. Lunches sound good perhaps but in priority lists it belongs at the bottom. How long can one keep increasing the burden of the taxpayer. This is a place where we can eliminate an unnecessary increase.

The school does not have facilities for a hot lunch program and I am opposed to the expenditure of any funds to provide it.

I do not believe that the benefits to be gained from this type of program are justified, particularly at Lewton, and I am definitely against it. The time my child now spends at home during lunch is a restful, relaxing period for him. He may eat according to his own eating habits, he can read, work on school work, visit or do as he wishes. Maybe for older children where cafeteria facilities are available the program may be justified.

For our son's overall development we definitely believe that the time spent at home during noon lunch make a very positive contribution. We would strongly object to his remaining at school during noon hour.

I want my children home for lunch. That's why we bought a house two and a half blocks from school.

I, too, have other activities, but feel the care of my children comes first. Also believe that the break away from school benefits both teachers and child.

Too many difficulties arise from acting in favor of such a few. Knowing from firsthand experience, it is also a great hardship on the faculty, not only during that period but later in the day when students become overly restless, et cetera. Also, most elementary students left most of the food on their plates as quantity-prepared food is never like home cooking. I am not in favor of this program.

I do not feel that a grade school child should spend that much time at school. I feel they and their teachers need a break in the middle of the day.

I believe te school board should not start any new nonacademic programs but rather try to cut costs in order to give us taxpayers a break.

Tax dollars should not be used for anything but educational needs. Lunches can be fixed more economically at home if the parents desire to do so. An effort can and should be made to help ourselves at a big saving in tax dollars.

Since it is needed by only a few, it adds additional employees, limits the use of the multipurpose room, is a source of trouble and problems with kids staying at school during lunch hour, and how naive can people be about the original source of Federal funds? How can we consider funds for this when just last year funds were cut which reduced the special programs.

I do not feel that it is the school's responsibility to feed and babysit the children. They have enough financial problems right now.

In our particular case you are asking for an increase of $80 to $90 a year. Any increase I vote for I would like it to go for education, not lunches, buses, et cetera.

This school district cannot afford a program which provides a service which is secondary to the primary task of educating children.

We do not feel that the taxpayers should have to bear this added burden, not that the public schools should become a babysitting agency for parents who shirk the responsibility of raising their children. We oppose subsidizing housing, in the form of 235 housing and we oppose "free" lunches. Nothing is "free." Our child walks a mile each way to school and needs the exercise. With a shortened lunch period, she could not come home.

Just another way to drain the taxpayer. Let's get sensible."

Big Brother already "helps" us quite enough.

I see no need for hot lunches for anyone! I survived 12 years of school and 4 years of college, and to date, on sandwiches. To this point I have enjoyed excellent health. So have millions of other people. Nuf sed.

We are violently opposed to the hot lunch program: (1) Lansing School District has more problems than it can handle without a giant additional one; (2) Even if the teachers receive additional money they will be less of a teacher in the afternoon due to no rest period (also, children are much more restless); (3) Having taught in a system which had hot lunches, accidents are more of a factor than some people realize. I don't feel schools should have a hot lunch program unless absolutely necessary because of consolidation, et cetera; (4) I have never voted against the millage in my life but will if the hot lunch program is to be part of the 24 mills."

I would like to see something available somewhere (perhaps at another school) for those who need a hot (or cold) lunch. I would hate to see little kindergarteners walking alone at noon while all the others stay at school.

As a former teacher of elementary children, I feel elementary-age children should go home at noon to unwind and prepare for an afternoon learning situation. If there is need for a lunch program it would be much more economical to bus them to a central location and not have lunch facilities at each school. They are already using buses at noon for the children and to have lunch facilities for the few needy is a very great expense.

If I understand paragraph one correctly, we are asking to vote for 24 mills but not have the educational services reinstated. This speaks to me that we have forgotten our schools are for education. If more information is not coming I would vote no on the millage for the first time in my voting experience.

It's too much money—and for all the wrong reasons.

NO ACCURATE SURVEY TAKEN ON "NEEDY"

The rest of the comments were similar in nature to the ones presented. Most of them felt the money should be used to further education and not feed the majority of children that do not need it. In discussing the lunch program later with many parents in the Lewton School District, I think the majority of them are in favor of a food program for the children that really need it, however, not all the parents whose children would have qualified for the free lunch were in favor of a lunch program in the elementary schools. In some instances, if the grade schooler is prevented from going home, the lunch of their preschool brothers or sisters is in doubt because of a mother working and the father, who works on a night shift, is sleeping, or vice versa. As of this date no accurate survey has ever been taken to ascertain the number of qualified needy in the elementary schools of Lansing.

According to the survey taken just recently, they have Lewton School with 132 needy students and with only 55 students being bused in and not all of those qualify, I don't know where they are getting the rest of that figure, because in homes that are valued I would say between $15,000 and $50,000, I don't know of anyone that would qualify in that district for a needy lunch. So I don't know where they are getting that 132 needy students.

As a mother of four children, I can say that most elementary children do not want a full meal at noon. A peanut butter or bologna sandwich, a glass of milk, and an apple or banana is just about all a small child will eat at noon. He also has to be urged to eat even that on some days or else in an hour he's hungry again. Anyone that has ever given a birthday party with more than four kids invited for lunch can tell you that the excitement of eating with their peers can wash an appetite right out the window. (Even the cake and ice cream doesn't get eaten.) Besides, the noon lunch break that the elementary child gets now offers an opportunity for communication with at least one of the parents at an age when the child will still listen.

I, personally, would like to see the money used to hire counselors for the elementary grades so that the difficulties that children are having can be assessed earlier in life and not allowed to grow until they reach seventh grade before something is done about it. I would like to see the family helper service expanded to include any family that is having difficulty and not just the ones of welfare and ADC. Very often the mother is working and staying off the welfare rolls but needs the family helper services as much as the ones that are on. The family helper could better assess the special needs of a given family and would know the proper agency to apply for help. In other words, why isn't the child getting the proper nutrition?

The family helper could also help teach mothers how to feed their families better balanced meals more economically. This would use the money on educational progress, not on supervisory help or equipment.

If the three meals a day the State board of education proposed becomes a reality, are the welfare and ADC payments going to be reduced or are the free meals considered a fringe benefit? If one of the reasons for considering a hot lunch for all elementary schools is the working mother, why doesn't the Federal and State governments allow more of them to deduct more of their actual child care expenses from their income tax and raise the income ceiling from $6,900—husabnd and wife adjusted gross income—to as much as $15,000—husband and wife adjusted gross income? Also allow the divorced woman whose husband pays child support to deduct at least half of her child care expenses.

WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY—PARENT OR SCHOOL?

Just where does the responsibility of the parent end and the responsibility of the school begin? After providing three meals a day for 7 days a week for the needy, will someone argue that this is now part of the free public education that everyone is entitled to and therefore everyone must be given a lunch free of charge? After that, it may even occur to some people that the reason Johnny isn't learning in school is because he doesn't have a proper bed to sleep on or has to share it with too many others and is not getting proper rest. Will this too become the responsibility of the schools? We, the taxpayer, have watched the welfare programs nibble away at the State budget, until we see now that the costs of that are greater than the State's budget for the schools. Are we going to see further erosion of the local school budget by welfare programs whereby the schools feed, clothe, supervise and sleep everyone and educate no one?

Thank you for allowing this taxpayer to add her strangled squeak of protest to the generally silent majority of taxpayers who are tired of the governments, local, State and Federal, giving them something they do not want and do not need and then demanding that they pay for it.

Senator HART. That was not a strangled squeak at all, that was a loud recital. A number of those who replied to that questionnaire did suggest an alternative method rather than no lunch program.

Mrs. HESS. I think there were about three, one was why couldn't they eat in their home rooms, this was one of the replies that was included in the response of the people. One of them, I don't know whether they included it or not, was couldn't they be fed at a central location, the needy, because actually in Lewton School I think in an actual count, out of 450 students we would have about 14 that would qualify, and it is absolutely ridiculous to put in a lunch program for that many students, to take care of that many children that really need it.

Senator HART. How about a school that the ratio was in direct reverse?

Mrs. HESS. Then I would say, well, let me put it this way. Michigan Avenue School, which is in the innercity area and is due to be demolished anyway because of the capital complex going in, then when they rebuild this school then put in the facilities that they need and even include in that, if they want to, a nursery school and a day-care center and a community center for the community, because we find it difficult in the children that are bused in to our school, they cannot partake in the physical after-school activities because of the busing, and so they are bused back to their communities and there is absolutely nothing that they have there that they used to have in their local schools. So I would say if they are rebuilding in areas where they need it, then fine, I don't think any one of us want to deprive a child that really needs it, but it is ridiculous to put it into a school that doesn't need it, I mean a great majority of those.

NEED OF THE CHILD COMES FIRST

Senator HART. It isn't you would agree whether the school needs it or not, you and I would care less about the need of the school, it is the child. Now, we agree, you just said——

Mrs. HESS. Yes.

Senator HART. No matter whose fault it is, if the child is hungry you don't want to fight feeding him?

Mrs. HESS. No, no.

Senator HART. It is the means, what is appropriate?

Mrs. HESS. Well, in your Federal regulations you say the child cannot be segregated, and this prevents our local school districts——

Senator HART. Let me be honest about it, I probably, although I didn't have a blessed thing to do with writing it, this is one of the things where I, as "Big Daddy", would probably disagree with you. Life is cruel enough when you get older, I would like to avoid imposing that kind of humiliation at least on the child, so you and I are out of step on that one.

Mrs. HESS. Now look, the children are bused back to their own neighborhood which is near this central location that there are lunch facilities available in. Now, who is to say whether the child goes home or whether he is dropped off at the door and goes into the facility where a hot lunch is available for him and supervision is available for him?

Senator HART. You are saying no feeding in any schools?

Mrs. HESS. No, I am not.

Senator HART. Who do you put on the buses at noon?

Mrs. HESS. They are children that are bused to our school from the inner city, and in Lansing we have a facility that has a school lunch program, that has facilities available right there, and I don't care whether the mother—a child could go there even if his mother is working and they do not qualify for a needy lunch, or for a free lunch, they could pay for their lunch, and this facility could take care of, well, it fed 300 an hour when it was a junior high, with the staggered bus scheduling that we have now anyway because we are busing kindergarteners back and forth, they have to be bused anyway, so you are not going to save on your busing either.

Senator **Hart.** One of the problems that was recited in this questionnaire, No. 5, most educators agree when there is a lunch program in the elementary the children find it harder to concentrate in the afternoon.

Mrs. **Hess.** More restless, put it this way.

Senator **Hart.** You mean because they have been fed?

Mrs. **Hess.** No, because they have been confined.

Senator **Hart.** That is not the theme that I have heard from most educators.

Mrs. **Hess.** If a child does not need it nutritionally, then he is going to become more restless in the afternoon if he has also been confined in a small area.

Senator **Hart.** Do you think it has anything to do with the way a person grew up, in his own personal experience?

Mrs. **Hess.** No.

Senator **Hart.** I was attempting to find a reason other than some philosophical one why you and I are not in agreement. You see, I never went home for lunch in all of my first 12 years of school.

Mrs. **Hess.** Did you enjoy your children?

Senator **Hart.** I was not conscious of being confined and unruly in the afternoon.

Mrs. **Hess.** When it is absolutely necessary because of consolidation of the school districts and a student would spend most of his time on the bus and this is impractical, but when a child is within walking distance of his home this makes a difference.

Senator **Hart.** I do have a hunch that our own personal experiences color our attitudes a lot.

Mrs. **Hess.** Well, your children attended Michigan Avenue and they came home at noon.

Senator **Hart.** Yes, they did. I am talking about myself.

Mrs. **Hess.** Didn't you enjoy having them home?

Senator **Hart.** I am one of those parents who, unless you understood the circumstances, could be labeled indifferent, I was never home at noon.

Mrs. **Hess.** Did your wife enjoy them at home?

Senator **Hart.** I would not undertake to answer that.

We had one over on Walnut Street. I didn't realize they had a feeding facility there.

Mrs. **Hess.** Walnut Street is for special education only, and this makes a difference because the students are different and it is a case of transportation again. It is like a facility where they are bused, they get out early, too. What do you plan on doing with the children after they get out at 3:30 in the afternoon and their mothers aren't home yet from work?

Senator **Hart.** Do we worry about that when we send them home a half hour later?

Mrs. **Hess.** It is not a half hour later——

Senator **Hart**. Or an hour?

Mrs. **Hess**. It is about 4 o'clock which leaves less time for them to get into trouble.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Cassidy.

THREE ADVANTAGES—SIX DISADVANTAGES

Mr. **Cassidy**. Your survey interests me. You list three advantages and six disadvantages, and one of your advantages, it would be No. 3, "It would be a convenience for mothers busy with other activities," could sound to some people rather frivolous. Your second problem or disadvantage says, "We would need some teachers to supervise, because of their authority. Is it fair to ask them to volunteer their only break in the day, even if it is for extra money?"

Mrs. **Hess**. At the time I made up this survey the proposed——

Mr. **Cassidy**. That is not really—in——

Mrs. **Hess**. The proposal of the school board, the guidelines that the school board was proposing was that the teachers would volunteer their time to supervise the lunch program. They have since rescinded this.

Mr. **Cassidy**. My point was really the wording, "fair", "volunteer", and "extra money". Fair colors it and I guess they are paid volunteers, and No. 5, "Most educators agree", would entail a survey of educators which is really different than my experience at a dozen or so hearings, I really haven't seen a preponderance of educators, but my real point is do you believe this is an impartial survey?

Mrs. **Hess**. No. I wanted the people to think about it before they answered on my survey, and either you are going to get them fighting one way or the other, you know, and I really wanted them to think about this because the most easy thing to do would be to say yes, to have a lunch program, because in our area we have a lot of volunteer workers, and it would be the easiest thing to do would be just to put down yes, get rid of your kids at noon. But I wanted to really make them think about the ramifications of the proposal.

Mr. **Cassidy**. Perhaps someone favorable to the program could put together some advantages that would have gone beyond yours.

Has the State board of education actually proposed a three-school meal-a-day program as you put on page 7?

Mrs. **Hess**. Dr. Porter, in his speech in Grand Rapids, I didn't bring it with me, in Grand Rapids to the Food Handlers Association has suggested that this is a reality, it will eventually come.

PURPOSE—ONE MEAL A DAY

Mr. **Cassidy**. Well, our purpose here today, I wanted to clarify the point, is to explore ways of providing one meal a day to Michigan school children. I am not aware of anything from the Congress in regard to three meals a day.

You say most elementary school children do not want a free full meal at noon. Your survey queries the parents. What efforts did you make to get the children's viewpoints?

Mrs. **Hess**. Most of the parents observe what their children will eat at noon and this is what I depended on. You ask any parent what his kid will eat at noon and 10 to 1 this is all they want. And yet it is a nutritionally balanced meal.

Mr. CASSIDY. You mentioned that the school—Lewton School, reported 132 eligible children, is that correct?

Mrs. HESS. This is according——

Mr. CASSIDY. What do you base your statement on then that there are, in fact, 14 eligible children?

Mrs. HESS. Based on the number of children in the kindergarten that get free milk and who would qualify for the free milk.

Mr. CASSIDY. Don't you think they might have access to information, personal information different than you? You are basing it really on your own——

Mrs. HESS. Look, there are only 55 students bused in, and I cannot see in the rest of the district in an area where the homes run between $15,000 and $50,000 where there would be anyone that would qualify.

Mr. CASSIDY. How many children are in that school?

Mrs. HESS. About 450.

Mr. CASSIDY. About 450. Might not there be personal circumstances, this eligibility is based solely on income, might there not be situations you are not aware of where people are holding on to their home but their income is below the eligibility, such as unemployment?

Mrs. HESS. I doubt it, they would soon lose their home and not be in the area.

Mr. CASSIDY. Thank you.

Senator HART. I should have asked this, maybe someone on the staff can tell me. From whom do we obtain the income figure?

Mr. CASSIDY. The parent.

Mrs. HESS. The parent that applies for the free meal.

Senator HART. So you are not questioning the State's figure, you are questioning the veracity of some of your neighbors?

Mrs. HESS. No; I am questioning in assigning family helpers to given families. They have to know how many would qualify, and if they are not on ADC and welfare they don't qualify for the family helper.

Senator HART. Does the family helper tell the State what your neighbor's income is——

Mrs. HESS. No.

Senator HART. Or does your neighbor tell the State?

Mrs. HESS. All I know is in our neighborhood I can't see, let's see, 40 some children that would qualify, 41, 40 some families would qualify in our neighborhood for ADC or for free lunches. And I wonder——

Senator HART. Are we in agreement that the judgment is made not by a physical survey of the value of the land or the appearance of the homes, but a statement made by each family to the State office?

Mrs. HESS. No, sir; no survey of that kind has ever been made.

Senator HART. Well, it is not fair any more for me to ask you than for you to ask me. We should have asked the State officer where does he get the figure that finds 55 in that 450 group that you say are not entitled to it, that he says are entitled to it.

Local School District Supplies Facts

Mrs. **Hess.** The local school district is the one to question as to where they get those figures. I think you will find that the figures of all the schools that have bused-in students have a factor that was applied to their school system that gave them a number of children, but the factor shouldn't have been included through the whole school district but from their bused-in area.

Senator **Hart.** We will get this on track for the record.

Mr. Beckham.

Mr. **Beckham.** A couple of questions.

If the argument is made in the future that once a school lunch program is made available in a particular school such as Lewton, those who are considered needy will get a free lunch, those just above it will get a reduced price, and et cetera, and the majority of the children must end up paying for lunch because of the high income levels. And let's assume someone decides to pursue the legality of such an act, on the basis that it is, in fact, a federally financed program, totally federally financed, and we all accept the philosophy that feeding and lunch programs at school is part of the total educational process, thereby it is the right of every child, without regard to income, to get that lunch free, since it is in fact federally financed and, in fact, is a part of the educational process and system. Would you then still be opposed to the free lunch program?

Mrs. **Hess.** Yes, I would.

Mr. **Beckham.** For the same reasons?

Mrs. **Hess.** Yes, because I think my child needs the exercise and the break at noon to really concentrate in the afternoon.

Mr. **Beckham.** In most schools the school lunch program, particularly when I went to elementary school, actually there was another 20 minutes after lunch to play outside in gym so you got the exercise. You are assuming this is not available?

Mrs. **Hess.** Well, I cannot see where it would be available on rainy days because the gym would be used for the lunch program and there would be no—you are going to have them running up and down the halls——

Mr. **Beckham.** I have run up and down the halls.

Mrs. **Hess.** Because this is the only other place that they could get their exercise.

Mr. **Beckham.** I have run up and down the halls before, it wouldn't be anything unusual.

Mrs. **Hess.** But 450 students running up and down the halls?

Mr. **Beckham.** Well, not that many. You would be opposed even on that basis?

Mrs. **Hess.** I am afraid I would, yes.

Mr. **Beckham.** In the school district you are in, I have been in the area there, I would agree with you the income level does seem reasonably high there, and again it is strictly from a physical appearance, but I think it is semiaffluent, a high proportion upper income, et cetera. Wouldn't it seem like a good thing or right thing to do, if we recognize other groups of people less fortunate, due to circumstances beyond their control, needing a particular program such as the feeding program, you would be for it and I would be for it, but with that recognition it would take but a little bit of giving on my part and your part to see how we could solve the problem?

Mrs. Hess. A little bit of giving for 14 students that could be taken someplace else and fed a nutritious lunch instead of feeding the 450 and putting in all the facilities to feed this 450 and supervise this 450 is ridiculous.

Mr. Beckham. If I were one of the 14 I would say yes, we would do it, like the crowd of 13 and one man is going to be hanged, but they take the vote it is 12 to 1. I am the one they are going to hang so I am not the one in favor of hanging. If I am one of the 14, if your child were one of the 14, would you want him shipped to another school?

Mrs. Hess. I wouldn't mind it at all. If one child is constipated you don't give them all laxatives.

Mr. Beckham. I hope hunger and constipation are not synonymous, excuse me, I wouldn't like to mix the two for a comparison.

Mrs. Hess. You give to the one who needs what they need and you don't waste your money on the other students that don't need it.

Common Ground—To Support Humane Acts

Mr. Beckham. I guess what I am saying is, if we agree a program is worthwhile and needed, particularly when it gets down to doing what we consider a pretty humane act in a civilized society, again, if it means a little bit of giving on my part, those of us who are a little more fortunate could reach a common ground on that point and not necessarily impose obstacles. Maybe I am wrong.

Mrs. Hess. I still don't see why they cannot be fed. If this is the primary concern they can be fed, and if you figure that there are other schools that have children that are bused in that do not have as high a percentage, you could feed these in a given area for less than you could by putting the facilities in all the other schools.

Mr. Beckham. I could pursue that in another area of education. They talk about systems in classrooms of separating slow learners or somebody who is slow in reading and slow in math from another group of kids, and I guess in school systems in some parts of the country they make it illegal. They call it the track system. You have to have a reasonable separation of learning speed in the classroom, but you don't segregate out a particular child because he has a particular deficiency, which makes him obviously different than the rest of the school. Feeding is the same thing. In fact, you have done the same thing in feeding the child that you have done to the child who may be reading one grade slower. At either end on the poll of measurement you accomplish, in effect, the same detrimental effect on learning and social programs and until we can recognize that and quit looking at the hungry child and feeding programs as something separate from the whole positive of going to school at 8:30 and leaving at 3:30, we are going to miss the boat on what we are trying to get done here.

Mrs. Hess. You are not going to fool the kids at all, even if you feed all of them at noon, because those kids know who is getting the free lunch and who is not. I don't know how they know——

Mr. Beckham. That is not necessarily true.

Mrs. Hess. In high school they do, because they go to the line and say their name and if their name is on the list they don't have to pay.

Mr. Beckham. They are trying to correct that. That is illegal, and we are trying to correct that.

Thank you.

Senator Hart. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. Kinney. Mrs. Hess, what percentage of 400 students go home for lunch?

Mrs. Hess. All of them.

Mr. Kinney. All go home for lunch now, none eat, or take lunch at school?

Mrs. Hess. No.

Mr. Kinney. What would you say the average income of those families would be?

Mrs. Hess. Of the whole school district?

Mr. Kinney. Of the 450.

Mrs. Hess. Of the 450? Very roughly, I would say at least $15,000 a year.

Mr. Kinney. And the 55, what would that be?

Mrs. Hess. I really don't know. Possibly maybe $10,000, as high as $10,000. I don't think they would be that high.

Mr. Kinney. I take it you oppose busing in the 55?

Mrs. Hess. No, I don't.

Mr. Kinney. You are not opposed to busing in the 55?

Mrs. Hess. No.

Mr. Kinney. You are opposed to setting up a total program where the 55 would—

Opposes Lunch Program for All Students

Mrs. Hess. Not all of those 55 would qualify, but I do oppose setting up a whole lunch program for 450 when only 14 or 15 would qualify for a free lunch.

Mr. Kinney. For a free or reduced lunch?

Mrs. Hess. Yes.

Mr. Kinney. Do you oppose also providing nutritional diets and nutritional education programs for all children?

Mrs. Hess I oppose providing a nutritional diet for children that are getting it anyway. I do not oppose nutritional education, which our children are getting in elementary grades anyway. I know because my children, in going through, I have four, one is a senior in high school, one is in 10th grade, one in seventh grade, and they have over a period of years brought home nutritional educational material and their projects in the school.

Mr. Kinney. You said you opposed children who are getting nutritional diets now, you oppose them getting nutritional diets?

Mrs. Hess. No, I didn't say that, I said I opposed giving children a nutritional diet in school if they are already getting it at home.

Mr. Kinney. Then you assume the 400 kids who go home have parents there waiting to provide them with a nutritional diet, then you assume those kids who go home getting a nutritional diet have less ability to concentrate than those kids who didn't get a nutritional diet. In your statement you mentioned some educators will agree where there is a school lunch program that the kid has less, he is unable to concentrate. Statement after statement has testified that a kid cannot concentrate when he is hungry. Here you say most educators agree when there is a school lunch program present the kid can't concentrate?

Mrs. Hess. When I made that statement I made it in a hurry and I meant to convey the idea that a child that is confined because of a school lunch program has more difficulty in sitting still and concentrating in the afternoon.

Mr. Kinney. So what you would be in favor of is that we find a way to provide a recess period but not take the lunch program from the kid? I mean the question isn't really whether the kid should have a lunch, the question is whether we should provide him with some time to get some exercise?

Mrs. Hess. Yes——

Mr. Kinney. In other words, you are in favor of a program of providing him with a lunch as long as we can provide him with play time?

Mrs. Hess. Adequate exercise.

Mr. Kinney. What do these 450 kids do now when it is raining?

Mrs. Hess. They run to school and run home.

Mr. Kinney. Everybody takes them and picks up the kids for lunch and takes them back?

Mrs. Hess. Sometimes on a rainy day. Sometimes they play around their own house.

Mr. Kinney. When it is raining?

Mrs. Hess. Yes.

Mr. Kinney. They will walk home in the rain and play in the house?

Mrs. Hess. Sometimes.

Mr. Kinney. Are you in favor of a program that would provide supervision to children under the school lunch program?

MUST PROVIDE SUPERVISION ALSO

Mrs. Hess. I think they would have to have supervision, and this is one of the difficulties.

Mr. Kinney. In other words, if your child was participating in a school lunch program then you want him to have supervision?

Mrs. Hess. Definitely. He would have to have it, he is only a kindergartener right now.

Mr. Kinney. What I am pointing out here, in your statement you mentioned it was not bias, but at the end of each one you mentioned needy——

Mrs. Hess. I wasn't biased.

Mr. Kinney. You said it was not?

Mrs. Hess. I said it was.

Mr. Kinney. You said it was biased?

Mrs. Hess. Yes.

Mr. Kinney. Because you wanted to create something on the part of the people?

Mrs. Hess. Yes.

Mr. Kinney. Which means that we want to create these answers we got in these responses?

Mrs. Hess. Those were the responses that I got. In talking with some of the other parents that had said yes. they were in favor of the program, after discussing it with them, I have discovered that a lof of them are not in favor of the program if it is going to cut educational programs.

Mr. Kinney. In other words, everyone is in favor of education providing we can provide it to kids who want an educational opportunity and then they would also like to have an opportunity to learn?

Mrs. Hess. I didn't get that.

Mr. Kinney. OK. You mentioned that most of the people would be in favor—would not be in favor of the program if it would take away from educational programs?

Mrs. Hess. In our area, yes.

Mr. Kinney. So what I am saying is you would like to provide an opportunity of education, provide an educational opportunity to learn? See, it is one thing to provide educational opportunities for one kid. and if a kid is hungry you don't provide him an opportunity to learn. We will go one more question——

Mrs. Hess. What I am saying is you give the child what he needs and you don't have to provide it to the ones that don't need it.

Mr. Kinney. So you would be in favor of the 14 families receiving some food——

Mrs. Hess. Yes.

Mr. Kinney. But you wouldn't want to force those other kids to eat if they didn't have to eat?

Mrs. Hess. If they didn't wish to.

Mr. Kinney. Now, I notice in some of these statements, are you also opposed to adequate housing in a particular neighborhood to provide——

Mrs. Hess. This was an answer by a parent and not me.

Mr. Kinney. OK. I want to make one other comment. In your questionnaire you said here it would be a greater increase in accidents. and you also mentioned at some point that there was a tendency for an increase in fights and what have you?

Mrs. Hess. This was in junior high and senior high; this is where most of the schools have this difficulty is during lunch hours.

Mr. Kinney. Is it because people don't get along well when they eat or is it because this is a break time and they don't concentrate?

Mrs. Hess. It is just kids. You put kids together in a unsupervised area and they are just kids, they are going to push in line, they are going to be just kids. And I don't care whether they are colored or white, they are just kids.

Mr. Kinney. So you would be in favor where we provide a greater opportunity for school lunch programs to provide supervisory staff at that time?

Mrs. Hess. Adequate supervision, yes.

Mr. **Kinney**. Thank you.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you. I have concluded by reacting to the very opening, there is nothing unsure or tentative about that squeak.

Senator **Hart**. Next we shall hear from Mrs. Gilbert Smith also of Lansing.

STATEMENT OF MRS. GILBERT SMITH, LANSING

Mrs. **Smith**. Senator Hart and other members of the committee. You asked me why I objected to the proposed lunch program at our elementary school. My objection is based on several factors which are central to the lifestyle that my husband and I have chosen for our family. We do not want to see any child in this opulent land of ours go hungry. This would be a crime, but we feel that the school is a place for education.

We are fully aware that a hungry child cannot function at his optimal abilities in school and we do gladly pay our taxes so that ADC food stamps and other programs to alleviate hunger can be effective. We strongly believe that the responsibility for feeding children rests with the parents of those children. It is not and must never be the school's function to provide meals for hungry children. The school's function is to educate children; to prepare them for adult roles in our society. It's the family's responsibility to minister to the physical and emotional needs of the children they bring into this world. Hungry children in this country are not needy children, but neglected children.

Our schools are not presently equipped to serve lunches. Our school board has recently stated that without additional millage we cannot provide adequate programs for the 33,000 children in our school district. How dare we, at this juncture, then, sacrifice academic programs to spend even one dime for any type of lunchroom facility. More so, even if the Federal Government were willing to foot the bill of this proposed lunch program thereby eliminating any need for local funds, I would still object to the lunch programs. Again, let me state that I feel hungry children in this day and age are a crime. I am glad to see the Federal Government taking an active part in seeing to it that there are no hungry children in the streets of America, and since we do have such excellent social programs as ADC, welfare, and food stamps let us make it mandatory that these receiving families then provide these hungry children with the much needed hot lunch.

My husband and I work very hard to provide for and rear our six children.

Senator **Hart**. Let me interrupt there. If you have an answer it would be great. How do you feed the children of the parents who won't feed them, what law will ever cure that problem?

Mrs. **Smith**. Find out why these children are neglected and then treat this sore, let's find out——

Senator **Hart**. Let's assume one parent is an alcoholic and the other a drug addict.

Mrs. **Smith**. Then that child is being neglected—

Senator **Hart**. No, no, I cite the extreme case to test the statement.

Let us make it mandatory that those receiving families, I assume that parent was receiving some welfare already. You have incompetent parents, what are you going to do?

EDUCATE INCOMPETENT PARENTS

Mrs. SMITH. Then let's use the money that would be spent on the lunch program. Let's educate these parents.

Senator HART. In the meantime what do you do about the children?

Mrs. SMITH. If the parents are being educated they are making progress right along with the help that they have.

Senator HART. Quick learners. They would have to be or else you are not feeding them. Education, particularly rehabilitation in the case I cite, would be enormously long, if you could ever achieve it.

Mrs. SMITH. You have got to start somewhere.

Senator HART. Why not start with the children?

Mrs. SMITH. Why start with the children, start with the parents and educate the parents.

I forgot where I was.

Senator HART. I interrupted you near the top of page 2. I just caught you on the concluding sentence on page 1. I can understand the frustration.

Mrs. SMITH. I might add I am from the Model Cities school, too.

Senator HART. I can understand the frustration of those that don't participate in Federal programs who are responsible parents and have to work extremely hard to make ends meet but nonetheless do, to see moneys go for the feeding of children of parents who are just the opposite kind. The only reason I interrupted was I was hoping to be able to make a point that the inadequacy of that child's parents is really a so-what in terms of our responsibility to see that the child is fed, and a long-term educational program means there is a long-term exposure for the child to hunger, that was the only point I was making.

Mrs. SMITH. My husband and I work very hard to provide for and rear our six children with pride, dignity, and respect. Our family is not what would be considered by American standards to be affluent, but we brought our six children into the world and we gladly accept the responsibility for these six children. We want our little ones to come home at lunch time so that I can accept the responsibility for feeding them and for finding out how their mornings at school went. We feel that this lunch time dialogue is important for the academic success of our children. If a hot lunch program is instituted at our school, our children would not be able to come home due to the time factor. Even though my husband is working hard to provide for our family, we could not afford buying three lunches at the elementary level, two lunches at the secondary level and continue contributing to our oldest son's college expenses.

KEY FACTOR—HOME NEAR NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL

One of the key factors when we bought our house was a neighborhood school. We wanted our children to be able to walk home at lunch time. Are we now being told in essence by the Government that because some parents do not feel an obligation to feed their children at lunch time that we must with our tax dollars support a lunch program for these low income children at the expense of our own children?

Neither I, my husband nor our neighbors want the children in our community to go hungry. Nor do we feel that we can sit back and let some of the children in our community be neglected further. We feel it is our responsibility as adults to object to any social program no matter how noble its ideals which would foster the further neglect of children. If a hot lunch program is the only way to feed these hungry children, let us feed them in their own homes under the supervision of their own parents. Sociologists since the early 1960's have been saying that the poverty problem in America all too often is due to the breakdown of the American family unit. We agree. Let us now reinforce the family in any attempt to wipe out hunger in America.

Senator HART. I shouldn't have interrupted you because in a sense you answered the problem I raised right at the very end. You say that rather than letting the children go hungry, let us feed them, let the taxpayers feed them "in their own homes under the supervision of their own parents". Now, in taking the extreme case of the couple who are incompetent as parents and everything else, you would in some fashion feed the children even though it couldn't be done under the supervision of the parents at home?

Mrs. SMITH. Well, let's face it, we can't have hungry children, nobody is for a hungry child.

Senator HART. I wish I had read the concluding paragraph before I interrupted you. I got the feeling at that first point you were saying pass a law to make those parents feed those children.

Mrs. SMITH. No.

Senator HART. And passing laws won't feed those children.

Mrs. SMITH. No, there are so many laws passed now that are no good, that won't work.

Senator HART. Well, the very one we are in here holding these hearings on, we are trying to find out if there is a better way to do it. That is exactly what we are trying to do.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank you for the opportunity.

Senator HART. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. CASSIDY. No questions, thank you.

Senator HART. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. BECKHAM. No questions.

Senator HART. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. **Kinney**. I have no questions but I would like to make a comment.

We want to express our appreciation for your comments. We need this kind of input from time to time for those people who have a great desire to see things of this nature eliminated and at the same time come forth and be able to weather the storm and take care of large families. I think you pointed out something here that oftentimes we start many programs that are very hard to discontinue. I think that is one of the main reasons for these kinds of hearings, to get the kind of insight to come up with something that will be very long range. We appreciate your comments.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you.

Mrs. **Smith**. Thank you.

Senator Hart. This concludes the schedule of witnesses to be heard today. We adjourn to resume at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning in the Veterans' Memorial Building in Detroit.

Finally, I want to thank everybody who took the time, gave the thought and expended the energy to provide us with this portion of the record. Without exception, it has all been helpful. We appreciate it.

(Whereupon, at 4:15 p.m., the hearing recessed, to reconvene at 9 a.m., Wednesday, May 26, 1971.)

IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC LAW 91-248, NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT OF 1970, IN MICHIGAN

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1971

U.S. Senate,
Select Committee on Nutrition
and Human Needs,
Detroit, Mich.

The select committee met at 9 a.m., pursuant to recess, in the Banquet Room, Veterans Memorial Building, 151 West Jefferson Avenue; Senator Philip A. Hart, presiding.

Staff members present: Gerald S. J. Cassidy, general counsel; John Quinn, professional staff; William F[illegible]ham, staff of Senator Hart; Joe Kinney, staff of Senator Henry Bellmon, Oklahoma.

Senator Hart. The committee will be in order.

For a brief statement of purpose I think that most people who are assembled understand this is a meeting of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, which has authorized this Senate field hearing.

The chairman of the committee is the able Senator from South Dakota, George McGovern. The ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Charles Percy.

Under Senate rules, its committees may proceed, providing there is one Senator present.

This morning we are fortunate to have represented an able Senator from Oklahoma, Senator Bellmon, in the presence of his staff representative, Mr. Kinney, who sits at my far right.

The list of witnesses today is available and we will try and proceed in that order so that those who anticipate testifying can schedule themselves.

May I indicate that those who have prepared statements, we will receive and print the statements in the record in full as though given in full. If, in the presentation, you care to elaborate on portions or to summarize, feel free to do so, and be assured the statement as prepared will appear in the record in addition to such comment as you offer.

May I welcome as our first witness the chairman of the Mayor-Common Council Task Force on Hunger and Malnutrition of the City of Detroit, herself from the School of Social Work at Wayne State University, Miss Maryann Mahaffey.

STATEMENT OF MISS MARYANN MAHAFFEY, CHAIRMAN, MAYOR-COMMON COUNCIL TASK FORCE ON HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION, DETROIT, MICH.

Miss MAHAFFEY. It is a pleasure to appear before the committee. Sometimes people have a feeling that they are not being heard, and the task force on hunger and malnutrition from the City of Detroit looked forward to this hearing because it was an opportunity to be heard by one of our esteemed representatives from Washington. We hope that this is only the first of several congressional hearings that will be sponsored by Michigan legislators (and perhaps this committee), in order to bring before the public the problems of hunger and malnutrition in the City of Detroit.

This select committee has heard in testimony in Washington and other places including lengthy documentation of the relationship of hunger and malnutrition to problems of learning in schools, problems of physical and psychological damage that occur when youngsters, particularly, as well as parents and senior citizens do not have adequate nutrition. In Detroit we find that the 1970 census income data is not available. This is important because our research, as well as that of the select committee, has demonstrated that it is difficult to document malnutrition because of the inadequacies of existing tests, and health reporting systems. The White House Conference on Food Nutrition and Health came to the conclusion that insufficient income is closely correlated with insufficient nutrition. Therefore, the White House Conference accepted the Bureau of Labor statistics low cost budget as being the figure for the cutoff for poverty and that anyone living below that figure would be suffering from malnutrition and hunger. Our Detroit committee accepted that same figure. As a result, we find that when it comes to documenting specifics of malnutrition in Detorit, we turn to income figures and surveys conducted in this city. I would like to point out also that in this State we do not keep adequate medical records of hunger and malnutrition. As a result, our own task force is strongly committed to requesting State legislation that will make malnutrition a reportable and treatable illness.

We do have gross population figures available for Detroit and the Detroit Community Renewal program survey conducted in 1969, documenting income and poverty in this city. That survey documents a figure of 20 percent of Detroit's households being poor, with 25 percent of the children being poor; 51 percent of all families with incomes under $3,000 are headed by a person of 65 or over; 48 percent of the families headed by elderly persons have incomes of $3,000 or less. Statistically, in Detroit we do know we have 3,500 mothers to be, mothers and their infants and young children receiving supplemental food as part of the maternal and infant care project, and we estimate, 53,000 persons eligible for that program. We are servicing fewer than in the City of East St. Louis, a city with a much smaller population than Detroit, Detroit is the fifth largest city in the Nation.

USDA REFUSES PERMIT

We have 44,000 receiving school lunches at a reduced or free rate and should service 127,000 if all children including kindergarteners were served. According to the Detroit School Board there are 127,000 public school youngsters who are in need of free or reduced-rate lunches. Last summer Detroit served approximately 25,000 lunches per day as an extension of the school lunch program, the summer feeding program, because we were allowed to use volunteers as our in-kind contribution. This year we estimate we could feed 40,000. The Detroit program was held up as an example of one of the two good summer feeding programs in the Nation (to a meeting of people from across the country concerned with this program). Yet the Department of Agriculture has thus far refused to permit us to operate that program on the same basis as last year, with an in-kind volunteer contribution. We have only one hot meals demonstration program for the elderly. It serves 1,000, and the estimate is that 15,000 need that program in Detroit.

We have no Meals on Wheels program. We have no governmental emergency food program. People are dependent on three private organizations and church donations. Food stamps will be available on a much more restrictive basis if the new food stamp regulations go into effect. If the Welfare Reform Bill that has passed the House Ways and Means Committee is signed into law, there will be no food stamps for ADC families. The food stamp bonus is $552 for a family of four. A 4-percent increase in Michigan grants, which is what some legislators are talking about, would be $146.40 a year. This will represent an income cut of $405.60 per family of four, if the ADC family is denied food stamps. The department of social services has already stated in its budget request that Michigan grants no longer meet the requirements of Michigan law. The grants are below the Social Security poverty line. Consequently, many children, already members of families caught in the squeeze of inflation and high unemployment, will face even further restrictions on family income and purchasing power via the loss of food stamps.

For example, there was some thought in the model neighborhood areas of food stamps being used to purchase reduced-rate lunches. Some of these families will not be entitled to those food stamps, and this will create an even greater demand for free lunches.

As we create more programs, we tend to increase and create larger bureaucracies, higher costs, and hungry children are caught in the cracks between the programs. Therefore, the task force will not only continue to support the school lunch program, but also the Bureau of Labor Statistics low-cost budget for welfare families as a more economical means to solve the problem. As I said, the task force feels very strongly that the school lunch program should continue in Detroit, and there should be a breakfast program. Both programs should be expanded. At the same time, we oppose very strongly any universal feeding bill that would include serving three meals a day to a family, for we believe that such a program would destroy the family by removing one of the functions of the family namely, the supply of sustenance to the children and the opportunity for the family to be together, at least for the evening meal.

The feelings of the school social workers about the school lunch program is best illustrated by some of the school social workers with whom we have talked describing instances where youngsters did not function properly in school because they were hungry. When breakfast and lunch programs were begun, performance—such as reading ability—improved, and as one teacher said, the children who are not eating are mean and cross. One principal made the statement that now that the youngsters are being fed at lunch, they are sleeping less in the classroom and learning more. There is utility in the lunch and breakfast program, but we still maintain the family should have sufficient income to feed itself for its evening meal.

Problems and Solutions

There are problems with the school lunch program and available solutions. (1) We have insufficient money for administration. We need more lunchroom aids, educational-recreation personnel. Equipment should be available without local match.

(2) We have inadequate facilities which sometimes creates a condition where a youngster has 12 minutes in which to eat, while he twiddles his thumbs for 23 minutes waiting his turn to get into the lunchroom or for the program to be over and go back to the classroom. Most of our schools do not have lunchroom facilities and the gym or multipurpose room is used. We need money for additional facilities and a sympathetic staff who are able to plan educational activities for the youngsters during the waiting period. Incidentally, neighborhood agencies near a school might be used to help relieve overcrowding.

We believe youngsters need a variety of activities and levels of physical involvement in order to learn. We would point out a program, a special demonstration carried out by the Association of Black Students in Detroit. They did a demonstration program in one school providing activities, enhancing participation and reducing discipline problems. There were 700 youngsters eating lunch in the school chosen for the demonstration—350 could be served at a time. While they were in the lunchroom, the other 350 were sitting on benches in the gym, each one sitting on a numbered spot on a particular bench. They were supposed to be quiet and still until such time as it was their turn to go into the lunchroom. There were two community aides to watch approximately 350 youngsters with the responsibility of keeping them quiet. The demonstration involved a series of activities during the lunch hour that included educational content, such as counting games, reading games, as well as physical activities and black history programs. The youngsters, as a result of that program had an opportunity to release some energy, and when they went back to the classroom did not present the same kind of disciplinary problems as was true prior to the institution of this program.

(3) The menus are, of necessity in our Detroit system, mass produced. As a result, they do not meet the ethnic and cultural patterns

of some of the youngsters in our schools. Detroit has a population of 60,000 Mexican Americans, and this is not reflected in the menus. Another problem arises when we find youngsters who are accustomed to eating certain kinds of food or certain combinations. For example, many youngsters are not accustomed to eating sandwiches with butter. They eat them with either dry bread or mayonnaise, and will reject the sandwiches that have butter on them. It is wasteful. On the other hand, we know that the youngsters will not eat butter on their bread, so why do we insist on serving it to them? The Federal requirements call for a teaspoon of butter or fortified margarine. Perhaps we need to change that requirement and see that the vitamin content is obtained in other foods rather than insisting that it be in a form that the children will not eat.

We also believe that children need to have a role in menu planning. We recognize that the introduction to new foods may have some value, but we believe it is less important than balanced meals of food with which the child is familiar. Some members of our task force go a step further and recommend decentralization of menu, food planning and preparation in order to include ethnic and cultural foods and provide job opportunities for students.

(4) We need commitment to this program from the central school board, the regional boards, and all levels of government. We need a well-planned public relations campaign to inform people of the availability of the lunch program. Some school personnel believe that the school lunch program takes too much time. At a meeting of school principals to evaluate the astro-pak cold lunch program, it was agreed that the longest it takes to service the food, prepare the youngsters for lunch and get them ready again for class was 45 minutes. At the other extreme, a principal stated that by having the school lunch program, his school gained 20 minutes of instructional time because the youngsters were sleeping only 40 minutes instead of 60. We strongly believe that there must be a rapid shift in the attitudes of many people if we are truly concerned about the health and learning abilities of children. A school principal for example, can make or break the lunchroom program. In some schools, the principal and the school community agent have gone on an agressive recruitment campaign, making sure that everybody knew about the new guidelines and the availability of food, encouraging youngsters to participate. Others have sent an announcement home and like many mimeographed announcements, it does not necessarily get delivered to the door. It may have been stepped on, it may have been used as a paper airplane, but somehow it didn't get home. The only newspaper announcement about the new guidelines and the extension of the free lunch program consisted of a small article on the comic page of one of our major newspapers.

Currently the board of education pays for the school lunch personnel whom the principal hires. Those school lunch aides have very little training in behavior management, and what they do get depends on the principal. Aides, we believe, should be equipped to help youngsters eat and be educated regarding food. Those aides also need on-going training in behavior management techniques and not just as short-term orientation, at the beginning of a year. Lunchroom personnel have been known to humiliate youngsters as though it is the child's fault that his family's economic condition causes him to need a free lunch. We believe the principal should be relieved of this responsibility of training aides. We need to develop an on-going program that runs throughout the school year and gives the aide on the site, if you will, help in handling some of the behavior.

(5) There is sometimes discrimination in the granting of the free lunch; for example, because a child seemed to be well dressed, the assumption was made that the parents must be lying in relation to their income. In effect, then, we are saying to people "Don't look good, trade your pride and personal care in order to prove that you are poor, by looking raggedy." Then you'll show you need a free or reduced-rate lunch. Although the law prohibits using the lunch program to discipline children, it still happens. Some personnel still ask children to identify the source of their income in the classroom, which means the child is asked to identify where his family gets their income. This puts the child on the spot in terms of welfare, public assistance.

(6) We are very aware that there are some youngsters not participating in the lunch program because of the overcrowding and resultant block system of scheduling, including some high school students and kindergartners who are in school for only half a day. Our goal for the youngest should be a lunch or breakfast at a minimum. We must make sure that the children are not held responsible for the economic circumstances of their families. The school lunch program must be expanded. There are some who believe that there should be a universal lunch program that is offered at such a low fee that there is no need to have a means test whereby one comes in and signs or indicates that he is more poor than somebody else and, therefore, should spend less or get a free lunch as compared to others. The stigma will be removed, we believe, when there is a universal lunch program at the lowest possible cost, and more adequate incomes for all families. We do believe the summer feeding program in Detroit must be counted with acceptance of Detroit's contribution in-kind. We would ask the help of this committee in obtaining the approval of the Department of Agriculture toward this program. We believe, above all, that it must be the right of all to live decently as human beings, that more attention must be given to the problem of hunger and malnutrition, particularly in Detroit.

This is why, in the beginning of my comments, I made the statement that we hope that this is the beginning of a series of congressional hearings in Detroit, so that we can communicate to our legislators, from not only the experts but also from the little people, their feelings and their concerns and their recommendations about the various programs related to the problems of hunger and malnutrition.

Thank you very much.

Senator **Hart**. It goes the other way, thank you very much for giving us what amounts, really, to a very complete view of the whole series of governmental efforts to insure that those who are disadvantaged economically are, at least, fed here in the Detroit area.

Children Hungry Year Round

As you know, our primary responsibility in this set of hearings is to attempt to identify where the school lunch and breakfast program stands; beginning, I suppose, with the question of whether it makes sense, and then what are the weaknesses and failures in the program. How can we respond to them—the inadequacies? But you mentioned the summer feeding program and, of course it reminds us that children are hungry on a 12-month basis, whether the school runs that way or not.

In the summer program last year you report about 25,000 lunches a day, and the Detroit matching money was of the use of volunteers, and you said the program was a success. Yet in connection with the school lunch program you report that there have been instances where the supervisory personnel, the aides, were poorly trained and, on occasions, thoughtless. Why were you able to find for the summer feeding program volunteer aides who made it work, and yet on a school lunch program you find the aides to be unsatisfactory?

Miss **Mahaffey**. The summer feeding program was basically a program of the health department with the cooperation of community groups. It consisted of a 2-hour recreational program, often carried on in conjunction with the department of parks and recreation, neighborhood settlement houses, and on school playground recreational sites. The people, the community people who were in charge and worked in the summer feeding program and worked with these other agencies, were given regular supervision from volunteers who had some experience in relation to the administration of the program, and also in relation to child behavioral management. I think there is something else to be considered. That is, that when the program is outdoors and there is more room for children to run and play and they are not being told to sit on numbered benches for 20 minutes, and when there are more personnel available to be with them than two people for 350, as in the school I described, I think this also cuts down on some of the problems. So you have a variety of circumstances that contribute to the success of the program.

Other Program Cuts Necessitate Greater Need

I would like to sa,y Senator, that we realize that the focus in this hearing is on the school lunch program. Our feeling is that the school lunch program has to be seen in relation to some of the other programs. For example, if food stamps are cut out, this will create more need for school lunch programs.

Senator **Hart**. You are very right, and that is why I indicated it is a very helpful statement on which to base today in Detroit.

I wanted to comment, and I will, on another of the points you made, that the House Ways and Means Committee bill does eliminate ADC families from food stamps. You say the food stamp bonus is $552 for a family of four, and a 4 percent increase in Michigan grants would be $146.40. This will represent an income cut of $405.60 per family of four if the ADC families are denied food stamps. Those who were so enthusiastic about eliminating food stamps, Miss Mahaffey, should recognize a very heavy responsibility if that is the road they want to go. I am sure that the school lunch and breakfast programs would have to be beefed up.

Miss **Mahaffey**. That is right.

Senator **Hart**. That is a walloping big income cut given the average family income requirement. I am not sure they realized what they were doing.

Miss **Mahaffey**. I don't know. This is based on the statements from representatives on the Welfare Subcommittee of the Michigan House of Representatives Appropriating Committee namely that they are thinking of maintaining the Michigan grants at the level that they are currently on, meaning the gross level of $3,660, which would mean a saving of some $50 to $60 million for the State of Michigan. This would be accomplished by cutting the State's current matching share of that $3,660. It would mean a great loss to the families, an increasing need for other kinds of programs, including beefing up of the school lunch and breakfast programs.

Senator **Hart**. The school lunch program here in Detroit, let's see if I have the basic figures straight, and I am taking this from the foot of the first page of your statement. School lunches, 44,000 at the reduced level, 127,000 eligible?

Miss **Mahaffey**. Right. These are figures from the board of education based on their estimates and their annual census, because we do not have 1970 census income data available to us. We simply have to make estimates based on the Community Renewal program study of 1969.

PROGRAM SHOULD REACH 127,000 IN DETROIT

Senator **Hart**. So when you conclude by urging an expansion of the school lunch program, you are saying, at least, let us reach 127,000?

Miss **Mahaffey**. Correct.

Senator **Hart**. I promise to communicate to the Department of Agriculture about this.

Miss **Mahaffey**. Thank you.

Senator **Hart**. I did not introduce the others here.

To my left is the general counsel of this Select Committee, Gerry Cassidy, and to his left, the assistant to the committee, Mr. John Quinn. To my right is Mr. William Beckham of my office.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. **Cassidy**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In your statement, Miss Mahaffey, you indicate you consider the facilities to be a major problem in expanding the program. In the schools that have the program, the lack of, you indicate that the lack of a separate room to be used strictly as a lunchroom is also a problem. Do you think that that is responsible for some of the lack of enthusiasm for the program among the teachers and school officials?

Miss **Mahaffey**. I think there are complex reasons as to why people oppose the school lunch program, and I certainly am not in a position to speak directly for teachers or administrators. I have talked to a number of them. There are schools I know of built in

1890, for example, with inadequate facilities. The playground is already filled with portables so that the children have no place to play. There is no denying this kind of problem. At the same time, I think that some people are unwilling to try to utilize what space is available. I know that in some facilities the children are eating in basement rooms, the schools are old and overcrowded. In others, I would maintain that greater creativity—such as educational, recreational programs for youngsters—could serve some of the same purposes as a physical education program and might be carried on during the lunch time period, and it would not mean that much of a loss in the actual school program.

Mr. CASSIDY. Are you familiar with the operation of any breakfast programs in Detroit?

Miss MAHAFFEY. I have very limited personal acquaintance with them.

Mr. CASSIDY. Thank you very much.

Senator HART. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. BECKHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I justed wanted to acknowledge for the record, Miss Mahaffey, yours and the task force's assistance and very direct involvement in putting together this particular hearing as it relates to witnesses, to material, data, et cetera. It is appreciated, and hopefully we will put it to good use. Thank you.

Miss MAHAFFEY. Thank you. We are delighted to cooperate, because we want to work with anyone who wants to, and is prepared to, help us find solutions. We appreciate this opportunity.

Senator HART. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. KINNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a couple of questions here, Miss Mahaffey.

You mentioned you fed 25,000 lunches as an extension of the school lunch program last summer. What was the cost of that program?

Miss MAHAFFEY. It was approximately, if I remember the particular figures, between $200- to $250,000, and we are talking about expanding it to 40,000. This would be the cost to the city which was met by in-kind contributions.

Mr. KINNEY. What was the Federal share?

Miss MAHAFFEY. That I do not have. I can obtain that for you before the morning is out.

Mr. KINNEY. We would appreciate that.

What was the rationale for the Agriculture Department not allowing you to use the in-kind service of this kind?

Miss MAHAFFEY. Their statement was that one midwestern city—we do not know which one it was—used the volunteer in-kind program as a means of, hiking the value so that they made some money off the program. Washington has no question about the fact that ours was an honestly and efficiently run, and very successful program. But because one city didn't keep accurate records, Detroit, which did keep accurate records, is being penalized. This is what we object to. The children are being penalized.

Mr. KINNEY. What value did you place upon the service of an individual volunteer, was that——

Miss Mahaffey. It was the minimum wage of $1.60 an hour.

Mr. Kinney. And these guidelines were in accord with OEO regulations along this line?

Miss Mahaffey. I am sorry.

Mr. Kinney. Usually volunteer services in-kind is usually a take-off from OEO guidelines, and I am sure the figure of $1.66 was within the proper guidelines.

Miss Mahaffey. It was $1.60. Mrs. Brown, Joyce, was that the OEO proposed guideline of $1.60 an hour for volunteers?

Mrs. Brown. Yes.

Miss Mahaffey. I thought so. I wanted to check with the person that helped write the program.

Mr. Kinney. Do you have an application pending for some extension of the school lunch program for the Department of Agriculture?

Miss Mahaffey. Yes.

Mr. Kinney. Did you send that through a local agency, or did you go directly to the school special services?

Extension of Program Denied by USDA

Miss Mahaffey. It went through the local agency. The local agency and a Mr. Byrd in Chicago, approved it. Mr. Byrd thought it was a good program, and sent it to the Department of Agriculture in Washington. However, at this moment it has been denied by Mr. Heckman in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Kinney. In your statement you talked about a group that the Association of Black Students formulated, a demonstration program to help combat this particular problem. At some point in time during these hearings certain individuals have asserted that the discipline problems have increased because of the additional time of the day due to the student lunch programs. Has this been the case in Detroit?

Miss Mahaffey. Well, we believe that this demonstration project demonstrated that if the youngsters have suitable educational and recreational activities, the discipline problems are reduced. For example, in this program there were about eight college students, both graduates and undergraduates, who divided the 350 into three different kinds of groups, and during the time they were waiting for the program, they had either a movie with a black history subject, or they had counting games, spelling games, et cetera, or they had physical activities while they were waiting for their lunch, rather than sitting on the numbered benches. The demonstration program bore out the thesis that the youngsters after they ate, and following this kind of program, were ready to settle down in the classroom as compared to their behavior when they had to sit quietly on the numbered benches or in the auditorium with nothing to do, waiting. I would think that this would be understood that elementary schoolchildren would find it very difficult to sit for 20 minutes doing nothing.

Mr. Kinney. So it is unfair to assume just because the lunch program is presently increasing discipline, but it is fair to assume by increasing the recreational activities we cut down on the source of the discipline and we also increase that person's attentiveness to learn because of the school lunch programs?

Miss Mahaffey. We know in good educational principles that children need a variety of activities with a variety of physical and mental involvement. They need a whole span of them, if you will, some differences, so they are not doing all the same thing all the time.

Mr. Kinney. At the bottom of page 3 you pointed out that some of the reasons why some of the kids are being denied is because of their personal appearance, and this is not an unusual situation. It kind of points up the fact in many, many instances, consciously or unconsciously, certain people in the various systems have a way to perpetuate the conditions because of preconceived ideas of what poor people are all about, which also points up, and I am sure you would agree, the need to install or to initiate a program of human understanding so we can understand what the problems are in these various areas when we try these programs.

What About Kindergarten Children?

You pointed out here that the kindergarten children who go home sometimes at 12 should either have a breakfast program or have a lunch before going home in the afternoon. Would this be in addition to some type of customary snack? Sometimes in kindergarten they give a snack around 10 o'clock and then the kids go home around 11 or 12 o'clock. Would you recommend he gets the lunch just before going home?

Miss Mahaffey. I would, and I think that Mrs. Wagner, who will be testifying before you, will beautifully describe the importance of food in helping a child be receptive to learning and, if you will, increasing their energy level and their ability to incorporate the education that is available to them. I would like to see the kindergartners have the snack as well as the lunch or breakfast.

Mr. Kinney. If you had to choose between the breakfast and the lunch programs as it relates to the ability to learn, which program would you choose?

Miss Mahaffey. I would find it very difficult to make a distinction. Obviously, the lunch program has more food in it, but I would think that our nutrition experts have pointed out sufficiently the need for three good meals a day.

Mr. Kinney. Would you oppose the three meals?

Miss Mahaffey. I am opposed to three meals at the public school which, in effect, separates the family. I think that the family, in our society, should serve its evening meal at home with the mother and the children, the mother and the father and the children together. I do not believe in separating the family to that extent, and I think if we do so, we are simply spending money that way, rather than increasing the grants, if you will, for the family to furnish its own food at home.

Mr. Kinney. This would also point out the need to better coordinate these activities, to see what parents are going to be able or can afford to have an adequate diet for a kid before he goes home. In many, many instances a kid comes to school without having any dinner the day before if he had lunch at school.

Miss **Mahaffey**. Right. The task force on hunger and malnutrition in the city of Detroit is convinced that the reason for this in 99 percent of the cases is because the family has inadequate income to begin with. The grant level from Michigan's families on public assistance would be below the poverty line.

Mr. **Kinney**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. **Beckham**. I have one question.

Mr. Kinny developed a pretty good line of thinking there relating to the number of meals we might begin to try to feed a child in school. Is it your opinion that the school system, if we develop this system becomes the best delivery system for feeding families, particularly children?

Benefits to Feeding in Schools

Miss **Mahaffey**. I think that the advantage to feeding the children in school arises from the fact that our schoolday is laid out with a very short period at noon, and it is much easier for the children to be fed at school, rather than eat in that time and run home and back. In certain neighborhoods there are additional problems. There are the additional problems of gang fights, of safety in terms of sometimes around schools we find old men standing around looking for little girls, to be very precise. I think the main factor is that given the short period of time for lunch, it is most economic in terms of time and energy for the child to be fed at school, providing he has activities so that he isn't sitting on those numbered benches.

Mr. **Beckham**. You have the same feeling about a breakfast program, I take it?

Miss **Mahaffey**. Yes.

Mr. **Beckham**. But dinner you would relegate to the home?

Miss **Mahaffey**. Right.

Mr. **Beckham**. Establish some supplemental program or some food stamp program, whatever it is, to accomplish that?

Miss **Mahaffey**. I would say yes, because we should recognize that any family that is living at less than the poverty line, and the social security poverty line was designed as a temporary living figure and not as a permanent one, is bound to have limited nutrition available to them. A family of four at $3,660 a year in Detroit is hard put to be able to purchase adequate food given the cost of living.

Mr. **Beckham**. If we were fortunate enough to be able to enact a basic minimum income, such as $6,500 a year, would you then be an advocate of feeding children breakfast, let's say, in school, probably still lunch, but breakfast or some type of meal or snack, assuming we accomplish this great feat?

Adequate Income Real Solution

Miss **Mahaffey**. The task force has gone on record that instead of the variety of piecemeal programs we have, we need to have adequate income. We would say, then, that in those schools where there is a short lunch period there should be a lunch program, but then people would be able to buy it at a minimum cost without the stigma that is currently attached by having to come in and declare that you are poor enough to deserve a free or reduced rate lunch.

Mr. BECKHAM. What we are trying to get at is if the Government, or other public institution, is not automatically the best vehicle or necessarily the right vehicle to impose its judgment on nutritional values, thus allowing families to make that judgment, and the family is given the opportunity and a decent income, then perhaps, in that way we would eliminate a lot of the need to have breakfast programs, lunch programs in order to meet the nutritional needs, then dinner programs that are advocated by some governmental institutions.

Miss MAHAFFEY. Yes.

Mr. BECKHAM. One more question that also came up. You mentioned all the conditions in the schools, the problems of crowding and eating in basements, et cetra. Do you think that the pursuance of the school lunch program under a system that has these kinds of obstacles, physical and mental, to the degree suggested that, by pursuing these programs we, in effect, create a built-in lack of momentum on the part of such programs? In the name of feeding the hungry we say at any cost and any condition, let's do it, the conditions are counterproductive. Are we then, in fact, actually slowing down or impeding the direction of feeding the hungry?

Miss MAHAFFEY. I think we must feed the hungry and I think any arguments that oppose the feeding of the hungry are, in effect, an attempt to abdicate responsibility for those in our society who are in need. Let me put that in very concrete terms. I think that we have for a long time been able to be creative in this society in terms of the development of new products, in terms of developing new ways of doing things in relation to human services, and I think we need to do the same thing around the school lunch program. Yes, I think it is a stop-gap program, but I think it is an absolutely essential program. This is the feeling of the task force. Absolutely essential. We must make it work at the same time that we try to eliminate the need for free and reduced rate lunches. We cannot stop feeding kids at this moment in history. We have too many who are hungry and too many more who are in danger of being hungry.

Mr. BECKHAM. Thank you.

Senator HART. Thank you very much, Miss Mahaffey.

Next we welcome the director of food services for the Detroit school system, Mr. Howard W. Briggs.

Mr. Briggs.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD W. BRIGGS, DIRECTOR, FOOD SERVICE DEPARTMENT, DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. My name is Howard W. Briggs. I am director of food service department of the Detroit public schools.

Unfortunately, Mr. McDonald, the president, Patrick A. McDonald, president of the board of education, was unable to attend the hearings this morning. I did present to the committee a copy of his prepared statement.

Dr. Norman Drachler, the superintendent of schools, also indicates that it was not possible, regrets it was not possible for him to attend the hearings this morning. He did indicate that he wishes me to express his appreciation to this committee for the valuable assistance it has provided the school feeding programs, and especially to Senator Hart, whose assistance spans many years, even prior to the establishment of a Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. We in Detroit are also most appreciative of Senator Hart's leadership in the fight for greater appropriations for all educational programs.

Senator Hart. Let me thank Norm Drachler for that statement.

Mr. Briggs. I will convey that message.

Senator Hart. If he thinks it is a good measure, if he thinks my performance was good and yet you see how inadequate everything is, it is all relative.

If you will, tell Pat McDonald his statement will be printed in the record in full.

Mr. Briggs. I will do that, sir.

(The document referred to follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PATRICK McDONALD

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, I am Patrick McDonald, President of the Detroit Board of Education.

I appear before you today as the official spokesman for an elected body acting on behalf of 300,000 children, at least one-third of whom are poverty stricken.

Our Board has long and repeatedly demonstrated its interest in improving food services to needy children. In both June and July of 1968, and again in September 1969, representatives of our school system appeared in Washington to present testimony before a concerned committee. Once again the opportunity is welcomed to share with esteemed members of Congress our deep concern for finding the means of assuring that every child who should have free food will have it.

Our record of progress in this area discloses that considerable, if not impressive, strides have been made in Detroit over the past few years in extending school food services to additional children. Two years ago, nearly half of Detroit's schools had no lunch facilities, and only 8,000 children received free lunches. Now all but a handful of the city's schools have programs and approximately 44,000 children receive a free lunch each day.

However, this dramatic increase does not belie the reality that one-third or more of Detroit's students come from impoverished circumstances. Our current estimates show that the number of students from poverty backgrounds might approach 125,000. I know you agree that they should all have adequate nutrition. Yet, little more than a third of this number get a free lunch.

Obviously, a very serious problem exists and one which I might add has commanded much community interest and concern. Many citizens groups have been invited by the Board of Education to express their viewpoints. Their interest has served to clarify the extent to which the Board of Education is faced with an intolerable choice if it must decide whether to feed hungry children or to provide them with needed educational services.

The Board recognizes that a child's diet is an important factor in his school performance, but it also feels that the public assistance agencies must address themselves to the problem of feeding all children whose parents cannot afford to feed them. Let it be understood, however, that this is not to say that the Board of Education is unprepared to assume the responsibility for the actual delivery of food services if the resources for this are made available in a way that readily permits their utilization. However, the fact of the matter is that funding sources do not exist on the needed scale. If they did, the school system would assuredly have availed itself of them.

In the State of Michigan, where the economy has been beset by price inflation and the effects of the prolonged recession, it is unreasonable for us to expect that State funds will be added to the extent that the number of free meals can be expanded to meet all the needs. Nor can we expect any sizeable assistance from the voluntary sector. The sheer magnitude of the problem demands legislative action at the Federal level.

Existing legislation must be improved upon to reflect the fiscal realities confronting our industrial states and virtually every large urban school system. This means the elimination of matching requirements. It also means full funding of existing authorizations. And, I might add my own deep personal conviction that it means a reordering of our national priorities.

I could go on to describe some of the technical means whereby more adequate funding could be made available, but I am sure that the committee and its competent staff can contrive a variety of satisfactory alternatives. This does not overly concern me. What I am somewhat concerned about, though, is that the work of the committee not be overshadowed by other matters confronting the people of Detroit and the nation as a whole. For this reason, I believe that it is vitally important to realize that the problem of feeding school children is not an isolated problem, but a part of such larger issues as hunger in general, family welfare, urban crime and related to it, narcotics addiction. If the connections between these problems are recognized and documented, then I believe that these hearings will have greater impact than they otherwise might.

Thank you for affording me with the opportunity to appear before you today.

Mr. Briggs. My testimony this morning is brief and, therefore, I would like to read it.

We have 330 public schools in Detroit with a student membership of 280,000. We are providing lunch programs in 269 schools and are serving an average of 91,700 student lunches each day. We are operating breakfast programs in nine secondary schools, serving 1,513 breakfasts daily; a pilot breakfast program in 18 elementary schools which serves 1,676 breakfasts daily. We are also providing lunches, snacks and teaching foods to 1,000 preschool students daily. We are operating 15 base kitchens, which are providing service to 152 satellite schools. Forty-six schools are served by self-contained kitchens and 56 schools have the Astro-Pack or cold lunch program, in which we have contracted with a food management company to prepare these lunches.

Since September 1970 we have opened lunch programs in 58 additional schools and are now providing food service in all but two title I schools. By September 1971 these two schools should be operating lunch programs. We have increased the average daily participation in the lunch program by 40.5 percent, or 26,000 lunches a day. Of the total lunches served, 48.8 percent are served free or at a reduced cost to needy students.

A daily average of 44,761 lunches were served during the month of March, free or at a reduced cost to needy students, as compared to 10,270 lunches during March 1970. This represents an increase of 335.7 percent. Yet, it is only 35 percent of the 127,000 students that we have estimated would qualify for free or reduced price lunches.

LIBERALIZED FREE LUNCH GUIDELINE

As of April 1, 1971, students from a family of four with annual income of $4,025.00 qualify for a free lunch. This represents a substantial liberalization of the free lunch guidelines compared to past years. This change was possible because of increased Federal support. Preliminary reports indicate that for the first time in several years, the food service department may end this year's operation with a slight surplus. During the last 2 years, the food service programs have accumulated an operating loss in excess of $480,000, that was not covered by prior operating surpluses. Nor does it include expenses incurred by the board of education for supportive services, warehousing, fringe benefits for food service employees, custodial services, supervision of students, et cetera, that have not been charged to the food programs. In 1968–69, it was estimated that to provide these services to the food service department it cost the board of education $818,350 annually. Certainly, the expansion of the food programs this year has increased these costs.

Our goal is to provide food service programs to all schools in the district, and to convert the Astro-Pack programs to hot lunch programs as facilities become available in these schools, or a hot lunch program is developed that can operate within existing facilities. However, the current and future financial difficulties that are plaguing the Detroit Board of Education and the city of Detroit will make this goal extremely difficult, if not impossible, to reach. Though each is a separate governmental body, cut back of services by one can seriously affect the other.

We encounter our most difficult problems in the elementary schools. The majority of these schools have been designed on the theory that most students would go home for lunch. For all elementary schools, we are averaging participation as a percentage of membership of 38.5 percent, but in many schools, participation of 50 and 60 percent is common. These figures do not include students who bring bag lunches from home. In most instances, a multipurpose room is used during the noon hour for the lunch program. It, therefore, is necessary for us to feed a large number of students in very limited facilities, and it is extremely difficult to accomplish this task without some infringement on the gym classes that use this same room before and after lunch. When classrooms are used, the difficulties are multipled. To correct this problem, in either case, will require large capital expenditures to construct separate dining facilities. The priority for the limited capital funds available to the board of education is given to the construction of classrooms, and Federal funds are not available for this purpose.

If I may, gentlemen, I would like to modify one statement that is at the bottom of page 1 and at the top of page 2 regarding the possibility of our operating with a slight surplus. I would like to be a little bit less optimistic, unfortunately, and rephrase it, that we will probably operate with a break-even point or a slight deficit. Just last week the accounting department furnished me with a statement of operations through December 31, 1970. It indicated the total loss of both the hot and the cold programs of $409,093.81. Now, I haven't had time to scan it definitely, and I am looking for errors and hope that I find some in our favor. I do know that they did not take into consideration nonfood assistance money that we have spent and will apply in the received, so I can reduce that loss to about $160,000 through December.

Surplus Commodities Help Budget

In January we began to feel the initial impact of Federal surplus commodities. This year has been a good year for commodities. In this aspect, some of our fortune comes from somebody else's misfortune. In this case, this year's breeders of pigs, the market was suffering, so we benefited by their misfortune on the market, in that we received somewhere in the neighborhood of $215,000 in value of donated pork. It is the meat items primarily that help reduce our cost, so that we have hopes that our food costs will be substantially reduced during the last half. The meat has lasted pretty much through January and has carried us on to our program now. Sometimes somebody else's misfortune is also a misfortune for us, and this is the case of fresh cranberries. We received, I don't have the exact quantity of fresh cranberries, in this case I think the best people that made out were the sugar beet growers, because they had to use a lot more sugar to sweeten the cranberries to serve them to the children. So the problem with the commodity system with the schools is undependable. We never know from 1 year to the next whether it will be a good or a bad year.

Basically I can go back over the years and tie in our loss or profit with commodities, it pretty much goes up and down. As we receive heavy meat supplies, we either have a very minimal loss or have made money in the past. As meat supplies drop down as a commodity item, we generally can experience a loss.

At this point I would be happy to answer any questions.

Commodity Support Should Not Influence Program

Senator Hart. I am glad you made that additional comment, because it reminded us, and we ought to put it on the record, of an aspect of this school lunch program that the public generally understands and doesn't buy. The motives that produced the school lunch program, as with most things, was mixed. One very strong area of support came from at that time very heavy commodity surpluses that had built up in this country. By funneling a lot of that surplus into this program, it had the effect of rescuing or rehabilitating certain of the agricultural economy, but it produced a wretched food assortment upon many occasions. I say that not in criticism of some of my colleagues from agricultural areas, because I have been guilty of the same thing. I remember periodically when our sour cherry crop was in enormous surplus, pounding on the Department of Agriculture to put cherries in the school lunch program.

Now, your operation of this program and the quality of feeding available to children really should have no relationship as to who is stuck with the big crop. I am glad you put that in the report here.

Mr. Briggs. I agree, we are relying more heavily on the commodities than we should from this standpoint. Seven years ago we were receiving in value per lunch served, commodities valued at 12 cents per lunch. This has steadily gone down. It hit a low of 5 cents per lunch, and in the past few years has come back up, so last year and the year before it was about 9 cents value per lunch, and again this helps us. At the same time last year, we turned in a record loss, so it didn't help us all that much.

Senator Hart. Well, before asking our staff to develop it, I think you have given us in very brief compass here each of the specific facts that one would require in order to determine just what the feeding program is through the Detroit school system. Incidentally, this is not easy to come by, as we discover as we go around.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Briggs, you testified before the Select Committee, I believe it was in July or June of 1969?

Mr. Briggs. Yes.

Mr. Cassidy. And at that time the increase, it still only represents serving, as you say, 35 percent of the 127,000 now needy or eligible children, but the increase you have shown in the program now I think is just about impossible. How much of this success can you attribute to increased Federal funding? What I mean to say is, I think you have the ability to administer a program that would improve, but there was a lack of adequate funding at the time, and now you have increased this much and there is an increase in Federal funding. What I guess I am getting to is, do you feel we need a lot more Federal funding before you can be feeding 127,000 or all the eligible children?

Need for Increased Federal Funding

Mr. Briggs. I would have to say yes. I think much of the increase is due to increased Federal support. The attitude of the Detroit Board of Education has not changed over the years. Their ability to furnish free and reduced price lunches has changed, and has changed because of increased Federal support. The desire to feed needy children, we have always had that desire, we haven't had the financial ability to do this.

Mr. Cassidy. I think you mentioned a very good point, a point that I think is perhaps the key point in the present legislation that is in need of changing, and that is the provision that makes use of funds from the equipment section of the law unusable for construction. Do you think that—let me ask you this way, what difference do you think it would make to the program if there were two changes in the program in the legislation, the first change being that the localities and States didn't have to put up a 25 percent matching requirement for Federal equipment funds and, No. 2, that those funds could be used for construction. How would that affect your problem here in Detroit, assuming there was adequate funding of that section?

Mr. Briggs. I think we could make greater—well, substantial changes in the program to improve it, improve existing programs, improve the service. I think that if we had better facilities in which to serve the lunches that we would have less disruption at noontime than the program sometimes contributes. It would be easier to administer and handle the students at noontime. So that the matching funds, for the most part, up to this year, we have used sales from adults in our program and have come up with the matching funds. The funds haven't been all that available, but what we couldn't come up with, we had revenue this way to match the funds that were available. Partially because of our—not partially, but primarily because of our need, for next year we are able to equip a base kitchen out of school construction funds, we have a new base kitchen that was being constructed, but the project lacked the necessary funds, and we have been able to receive nonfood assistance in this manner.

FACILITIES ARE PRIME CONCERN

Facilities are one of the things that I think we lack the most. We have schools that go back to well over 80 years of age, at least 11 schools. Many of these schools, the older schools, are in the inner city, and these are the schools where we have substantially installed the Astro-Pack program, simply because we could move in with a refrigerator, and in contracting for lunches, we did not have to build a facility, we do it ourselves, and it allowed us to expand rapidly. We could not have provided expansion of 58 schools without the program. With both programs, be it hot or cold, we realize, I guess what I am trying to say, we can always improve, it doesn't remain stagnant, we are not constantly using the same menus, we do revise them. We meet with student groups for their comments. It is not done on a regular basis or a scheduled basis, but it is done at every opportunity that we can, to be able to talk to principals, teachers, and students to get their reactions to the menus and to the food that is prepared or sent to them, so that we need more of this.

Again, the facilities are, I think, of prime concern for the objection, in some cases, from the administration. It makes it difficult to administer the program that needs it.

Mr. CASSIDY. What is your opinion of the breakfast that the Department of Agriculture has approved for use as an entire breakfast, the breakfast program?

Mr. BRIGGS. I don't think very much of it, primarily because although it is fortified and engineered to provide all the requirements, cake and milk is not a breakfast mix. I don't believe it is conducive to good eating habits, it does not teach what a balanced breakfast is. I think if a student eats cake and milk at school for breakfast, that he can safely assume that cake and pop on the way to school is just as good, and that is breakfast, and I think this is teaching bad eating habits. If we were back to the wall and there was no other way to reach the child, we would use it, but we would not call it breakfast, I would call it a snack. I would claim breakfast reimbursement for it, but I would not label it a breakfast.

Mr. CASSIDY. Do you think there is danger of going in that direction, of one-unit neals like a Twinkie, that has the effect of saying to poor children, this is good enough for you, you don't eat a regular meal?

Mr. BRIGGS. I think there is that danger, not really only for poor people, but for all of us. I think we are losing the whole value. I think it should be eaten and it should be enjoyed, from this standpoint. We should be teaching proper nutrition which we don't do enough of, there is no question about that. I think it is trying to find the simple solution to a complex problem, and I think it is the wrong solution to the problem.

Mr. Cassidy. What impact has the change in regulations allowing private industry to enter the school lunch program as a supplier and to bring their technical skills into the program? What impact has that had as you have seen the school lunch program?

Mr. Briggs. I think it varies from district to district. What we are doing in Detroit, actually, with the exception that we are furnishing the contractor with commodities, but what we are doing in Detroit has nothing to do with changing the regulations. It could have been accomplished 10 years ago. It was not probable that it would have been done 10 years ago, because basically it was a coming together of a lot of people and a lot of changing in the attitude. We are receiving greater reimbursement for the Astro-Pack program than we are in the regular hot lunch program. This was essential to the start of the program. We got started in the program because of involvement of new Detroit. Their involvement came about because of the lawsuit that was brought against the city of Detroit, so last year there was really a coming together of ideas that allowed us to develop the program and get it, we feel, improved and checked out before administering to a large number of schools. In that way we were able to solve some of the problems of the program, but basically a lot of it is attitude. Much of it is, again, Federal funds, the availability of Federal funds, as to what impact it would have. I think it would be a mixed impact on the school lunch program. I think there are cases, undoubtedly, where a contractor will be involved in a school lunch program where the school district would have been better off leaving it operated by the district. I think, also, that there are cases where perhaps a contractor would add the expertise that was needed to make and improve the program of the school district. I am not in a position to say where or how, but I believe in just generalization there has got to be some of both where there would be advantage and disadvantage.

I don't think that it is going to make as big an impact as the contractors themselves. Initially they were going to come in and feed all the children. I think basically, and I think one thing that ought to be kept in perspective, is the availability of Federal funds. If suddenly funds are available, we can certainly do a lot more if we have the money, and if the same money could have been made available to us or to the school districts a long time ago, without a contract managing company, the same progress could be made.

Mr. Cassidy. That is a point that really I think has reoccurred through all the hearings, the progress as related to increased Federal funding. It should be obvious, but it is a point that I think is really well worthwhile.

Thank you.

Senator Hart. Mr. Beckham.

WHAT IS QUALITY OF ASTRO-PACK?

Mr. **BECKHAM.** Mr. Briggs, what is your opinion of the quality of the Astro-Pack?

Mr. **BRIGGS.** I honestly believe that the body is comparable, that it is a suitable quality, that is a satisfactory quality. We have had some problems in the program which, again, is a continuing process. One of the things we have found out when we started the program in a large number of schools this fall was that both ourselves and the contractor had put our interest in other areas, which was a mistake, from the standpoint it took us a little time to realize that actually the quality of the lunch that we were receiving in September was not the same quality of the lunch we had used in the pilot program. We believe that we hold now meetings every 2 weeks with representatives from the food service department and the contractor, reviewing the items that are causing the problems, so that we are making changes in the menu and rejecting items. We have rejected some items and removed them, because we did not feel the quality was suitable, meatloaf in this case, being one item. The contractor, the company readily substituted Canadian bacon in a bun, which has gone over tremendously well, except one time they got a bad product.

They are supplying, roughly—well, they are furnishing, we are counting 12,000 lunches a day, but they are generally furnishing or putting together 13,000 to 14,000. The most recent instance that comes to mind would be where we have used a hard-boiled egg in the program, and the last time the egg appeared on the menu, which I think was last week, it was not hard-boiled, which caused us a tremendous amount of difficulty and trouble. It was not the first time that it had occurred, but there, again, this was a subcontractor supplying the egg. We are not claiming any reimbursement for the lunches, for this the company will experience the loss, and I am sure they will pass it on to the subcontractor. To end the problem we are taking the egg off the menu.

LACK OF VARIETY IN COLD LUNCH

At the same time, the difficulty with the cold lunch is that it is harder to come up with variety with cold food than it is with hot food, so that when we remove an item like this and take it from the menu, certainly it decreases the variety that we can offer. Well, it is one of those things that we simply have to do, but it does limit the variety and sometimes I think the acceptance of the lunch. The acceptability of the lunch from the students as a percentage of membership, the participation is not much different in the Astro-Pack program than in the hot lunch program. Again, the difficulties are about the same in both. There isn't a great deal of difference in the two programs, be it in food that is not eaten and is, therefore, thrown away. The problem here is not really so much the quality of the food as it is getting the child to taste the food. There is where a lot of the problem begins, just getting the child to taste the food. This is not unusual with children, I have the same problem at home with this, and this is where personal attention would be, you know, best; eating in small groups with an adult would be the ideal situation, where you can hold conversation and coax the child, if need be. Once this can happen, get one child to taste it, it often means another child will come over and see what is going on and he will taste it, will want to taste it, but our tastes do differ from one to another.

Mr. **Beckham.** This would relate to Mrs. Mahaffey's comment in her statement about the need to have trained personnel supervising the lunch who had the ability to begin to educate children as to the needs to eat; the association of good eating and good nutrition. Wouldn't you agree?

Mr. **Briggs.** There are, you know, some of these people in the program. I think it is more perchance than because we have trained them that way, but I think training, be it food service people, be it the noon hour aides to supervise the children in the dining rooms, training is essential.

Mr. **Beckham.** Is it fair to say that given the option of an Astro-Pack or a hot lunch program in the school, you would go with the hot lunch?

Mr. **Briggs.** We would prefer the hot lunch program because of the added variety and general acceptability. I think hot and cold sometimes, though, is honestly more of a hangup that we have as adults. The children don't always have this same hangup so far as sandwiches and being opposed to them.

Again, one occasion we ended up putting covers on all the containers. We were trying to first get eye-appeal into the lunch, and this kind of thing. We were trying without covers and it just doesn't work, because we end up with soggy sandwiches, so to correct that situation we now put covers on the lunches so we lose some eye-appeal.

Mr. **Beckham.** Under the present physical conditions within the Detroit school system is it possible to attain 100 percent feeding of the needy? If you go to hot lunch programs, I mean if that is, in fact, what you would like to get to, is it possible under the present conditions, to achieve 100 percent feeding of those considered needy?

Mr. **Briggs.** Over a period of time it is possible. We would anticipate changing or converting some of the Astro-Pack programs this year somewhere between three and five to a hot lunch program. Two of the schools are fortunate in that they are having an addition built to the school which includes a multipurpose room. This gives us the needed facilities. In others, either through a remodeling process, the removal of a wall that either has been accomplished or will be accomplished, we feel we have the facilities to put in a hot lunch program. We feel we need a minimum of a sink, some work area, a separate room to set the lunches up in the hot lunch program. When we originally put the program in, we were in a satellite program. We made mistakes in these areas, and we went into schools that there was no question in my mind that we should not be there with a hot program, that the school should have a cold lunch program that is better situated for them. But I think if we went in at this time and said, we are going to change to a cold lunch program, we would have the community up in arms to avoid the situation, although it is an extremely difficult situation under which to operate a program.

MANY FACILITIES NEEDED TO ACHIEVE 100 PERCENT

Mr. **BECKHAM.** In all fairness, is it fair to say unless funds are provided, capital outlay for facilities, et cetera, you probably could not achieve an effective 100-percent program of feeding the needy a hot lunch without the changes in facilities.

Mr. **BRIGGS.** Without a lot of changes it would be impossible.

Mr. **BECKHAM.** That is the point I wanted to make.

Thank you.

Senator **HART.** Mr. Kinney.

Mr. **KINNEY.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Briggs, you mentioned you feed approximately 1,000 preschool children daily—I am sorry, you train that many——

Mr. **BRIGGS.** No, we are providing teach-in foods, lunches and snacks.

Mr. **KINNEY.** When you say teach-in foods, to what are you referring?

Mr. **BRIGGS.** In this case when we initiated the Headstart program, when it was introduced in Detroit, it was a summer program. They used for the first 2 years a breakfast program, a bowl-pak cereal, milk and juice. The third year they went to a full day and had to furnish lunch, as opposed to breakfast. We were involved in the program and tried to work in teachers, such as today we would furnish a head of cabbage, tomorrow the teacher would talk about cabbage in its raw form to the students. The day after that they would get it as cole slaw, so they could see the relationship between the foods as they are grown and the food that we eat. So they know what a head of cabbage looks like, and we would carry it out through the program where it has worked out with the teachers. In fact, tomorrow I will be meeting with a committee from Headstart or pre-school program whereby we will review the menus and the teach-in foods. We also try to give them background material on the foods. We feel it is a good way to work in nutrition in education.

Mr. **KINNEY.** What has been the strength of this program? Do you get better acceptability on the part of the children to try the food on the diet?

"DON'T TAKE THE SALADS AWAY"

Mr. **BRIGGS.** I think we get better acceptability. The comments that were made by the teachers that I visited with a couple of weeks ago, and primarily it was a complaint session, it didn't quite end up that way, but their one comment was don't take away the salads. The children did not want the salads and it was difficult to begin with, and initially it is, but now they feel the children are going home and wanting salads at home. So not only are we reaching the child, we are reaching the parents in the various types of foods. I think sometimes we are missing an excellent opportunity, be it mass education, so that their one comment was don't take the salad away. At the beginning of the year they might have very well have said cut down on the salads, the kids aren't eating them.

Mr. **Kinney.** You see the need as we initiate a food serving program, we need to tie it in with an educational concept and educational training so everyone involved can understand the nutritional value?

Mr. **Briggs.** Very much so.

Mr. **Kinney.** A curriculum needs to be built or needs to supply additional money in this area?

Mr. **Briggs.** Really, I will be honest with you, the southeast United States does a better job of this than any region that I know of. For a long time I think I accepted the fact we were in the North and this was not possible in the North. A year ago one of my supervisors, Mrs. Washington, was saying, you know, we should do something about it, and I guess partially to get her off my back, I said, why don't you go talk to Dr. Luby and see what he says. He welcomed it with open arms. Now, unfortunately, we really haven't developed the time, but we have the spirit of cooperation. If we can jointly develop a nutrition-education program, it will be put into the lower elementary grades, and this is really where it has to start.

Mr. **Kinney.** What was the attitude on the part of the teachers and instructors regarding the implementation of this additional burden on the part of the teachers?

Mr. **Briggs.** It is not really an additional burden, it is part of their job. It would be worked into the lesson plans, they would have the curriculum. There are many ways to tie in foods with other subjects, be it geography, history, and so on, so it would not be an additional assignment. It is one that they have a section on now, but I am not sure that it is sufficient to really do an adequate job on nutrition education.

Mr. **Kinney.** So you have——

Mr. **Briggs.** We haven't put it in yet, but I really expect that it will be.

Mr. **Kinney.** You mentioned here all but two of the title I schools have school service programs at the present time.

Mr. **Briggs.** Right.

Mr. **Kinney.** What percentage of those title I children would fall under the categories of receiving free or reduced lunches, approximately?

Mr. **Briggs.** I really couldn't give you that information, I don't know. We have to go on a school basis. My recollection, it would seem that most of the schools where free lunches are available, although they are wherever there is a program, the bulk of the free lunches would come from our title I area schools.

Mr. **Kinney.** How many title I area schools do you have now?

Mr. **Briggs.** I think it is now 123, or something on this order, but they have dropped from that to the title I–C schools. They run in categories of A, B, and C, and the 121 or 122 include only the A and B schools, of which the figure which comes to mind there is something like 86,000 or 83,000, somewhere in that area, of feeding students in those schools. This is really where the basis of the 127,000 estimated needy children comes from, our title I schools.

Mr. **Kinney**. What has been the major reason why these particular two schools have not been included at this time?

REGIONAL BOARD REQUESTED EXCLUSION

Mr. **Briggs**. In one school, Harding, which is out, really, on the extreme west side, close to the Rouge Park area, it qualifies as a title I school. It is a "C" school. It qualifies primarily because of the housing project. There we have the facilities, we did not initially, but we have since installed a sink, the tables are there, it was a school that had a kitchen at one time, so that it has adequate facilities. We met with both the principal, the new region board, and the region superintendent, in I guess it was February, and there we were requested not to put the program in until September, because they just rescheduled one group of children and had to reschedule another to put the program in. It was felt they would have to reschedule all the junior high school students to put the program into the school. The facilities are there, and there it was done at the request of the regional board.

A second school that is without the program is the Ives Elementary, which is on the extreme east side. There we lack tables. Ives was added to the list. In reviewing it, many times as I reviewed the list of poverty area schools, for some reason we had not included the Ives on our list, and when it was discovered the mistake had been made, it was put in, more of an afterthought, so we did not have the tables ordered, but as soon as they are, the program would be in effect, but I would have to admit at this stage of the game, we would probably not put it into the school, even if the tables arrived tomorrow, until September.

Mr. **Kinney**. When does the school term end?

Mr. **Briggs**. Probably within 2 or 3 weeks, about the middle of June.

Mr. **Kinney**. You mentioned here on page 2—I am sorry, down at the bottom of page 1, that you have been able to expand the school lunch program due to the increase in Federal money, and you raised the level of income to $4,025 for a family of four, to receive free or reduced price lunches. It is fairly easy to see that you could possibly run the risk of decreasing the number of people served, even though you had increased moneys, and last year you had a considerable number of people who fell within this particular income range. Now, what percent of the 65 percent, or 127,000 children, would fall in that $4,025 range?

Mr. **Briggs**. I have really no way of knowing. The figures, and really the basis of our title I figures, go back to 1960, they are based on the 1960 census. Since that time in Detroit there has been a great deal of mobility, so that some schools, I am sure, that were not title I schools, certainly are now or will be when we get a new list made up based on the 1970 census. Much of it is based on conjecture, from the standpoint that I believe title I OEO is 3,000 something, it is at a 3,000 level, and using that as a basis, and basically I guess I am responsible for coming up with 125,000, it is not all that scientific, but I think a reasonable figure in view of the information that is available to us, but there is a certain amount of guesswork that went on or assumption.

Mr. Kinney. So it is not unfair to assume that by increasing the level of qualification, that you missed considerable numbers of people that would have received free lunches under the present program?

Mr. Briggs. No. Basically the $4,025 figure was a figure we were using for reduced cost.

Mr. Kinney. Before you had an increase in Federal funds?

Mr. Briggs. Oh, yes. In January $4,025 for a family of four was the guideline for reduced price lunches, so we know——

Mr. Kinney. That clears it up. It gave me the impression it was another level before you increased it.

Mr. Briggs. No. For free lunches it was $2,825, so we went from $2,825 to $4,025.

Mr. Kinney. For free lunches?

Reduced Price Lunch—"If"

Mr. Briggs. For free lunches, but, again, we are still talking about a group of children that we are serving, except some of the children were paying at a reduced price. Anybody above $2,825 was receiving a reduced price lunch if they had applied for it, and that is a big "if."

Mr. Kinney. So you are aiming to make those lunches free?

Mr. Briggs. Yes. Initially the impact, and I know you have indicated the question yesterday, is what the initial impact has been for April, and I have checked the figures this morning and substantially there is a slight increase, but it is nominal in this. Basically it has been a shifting of reduced price lunches to free lunches. The publicity that it was possible to give this since has been very limited. The articles, two articles, one article appeared in each paper, what was basically buried, was not given page 1, which I suppose they have their priorities, too, and expect this to be a page 1 story, it is of concern to us, but not necessarily the papers. We have had better publicity since the announcement of the Select Committee, in that I believe the guidelines have been indicated in this. We publicized it to the principals. It was in the Pipeline that is published by the superintendent after each board meeting. The full guidelines were published and that was distributed to the total staff of the school districts, but the public itself has not been given, it has not received a great deal of publicity, I am sure, in the public sector, not sufficient to do it. I note in September we will probably be again sending out another letter home to the parents, and I would also assume by September the guidelines would be higher than $4,025. I have no way of knowing for sure, but I would expect that the State would increase the guidelines. If they don't I would be very much surprised.

Mr. KINNEY. As a public service agency, have you been able to take advantage of radio and TV in giving these announcements?

Mr. BRIGGS. No. We send them information in a press release, and, again, it depends whether it is a good news day or a bad news day.

Mr. KINNEY. This may be one avenue you want to look into. We are addicted to TV and radio, but we pay little attention to reading printed material that is special to some communities, and sometimes small children might take this as an announcement that he might have been a bad boy in school and it might not get home.

One other question. Your arrangement with private contractors. What is the cost of the meal to the schools?

Mr. BRIGGS. We estimated it in September at 68 cents, I believe, and I think I have got——

Mr. KINNEY. What would a student pay for it?

Mr. BRIGGS. Twenty cents is the maximum cost of that lunch. We felt basically——

GROUP OF VOICES. No more hearings, we want food; no more hearings, we want food; no more hearings, we want food; no more hearings——

[Gavel sounded.]

VOICES. We want food——

Senator HART. All right, listen——

VOICES. No more hearings, we want food; no more hearings, we want food; no more hearings——

Senator HART. Settle down——

VOICES. We want food. Let the people speak; let the people speak; let the people speak; let the people speak; let the people speak; let the people speak; let the people speak; let the people speak; let the people speak; let the people speak; let the people speak.

MALE VOICE. Let the people speak.

[Gavel sounded.]

Senator HART. We will make a part of the record the message that you have given us.

FEMALE VOICE. We haven't given it yet.

MALE VOICE. Yes.

Senator HART. Well, give it; we welcome it.

FEMALE VOICE. How come you turned down the Westside Mothers when they asked for a speaker?

MALE VOICE. You don't welcome it unless people fight for it.

FEMALE VOICE. That's right.

Senator HART. You are welcome; now put it on the record. Inevitably we are going to get more money for a school program. We are going to have a record——

MALE VOICE. There is plenty of money, we don't need that crap.

Senator HART. Is there anything——

MALE VOICE. Plenty of money.

Senator HART. Is there anything else you would like to say?

FEMALE VOICE. Yes.

MALE VOICE. Yes.

Senator HART. All right, put it on the record.

STATEMENT OF JOHN SCOTT, DETROIT HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT

Mr. SCOTT. Well, I am John Scott, a high school student. I have a brother and a sister that goes to the Detroit school system. I think that food for all high school kids or for all kids in school should be free. We shouldn't have to pay for food we get. More than that, it should be good food, you know, not the junk they serve in school. Like at Borroughs the students had a strike around miserable food and only 60 kids showed up in school. All these hearings and stuff don't accomplish anything. We have hearings and even more hearings, and we still get bad food and kids have to pay a great deal of money for this lousy food they get in school. These hearings are a bunch of junk, and we shouldn't have these hearings. What we should do is, you know, fight for food. You like the kids and with parents and demand food and spoke for food, not ask for food and have hearings. I mean, like, you know, all the liberal politicians get together every once in awhile and say, we are going to solve all these problems, but they never do. There hasn't been a liberal politician since the 1800's and people are still getting messed over. So we shouldn't have these junky hearings, we should organize. Unite, students and workers, to fight for food.

MALE VOICE. That's right, don't fall for liberals and their lies.

VOICES. Don't fall for liberals and their lies; don't fall for liberals and their lies; don't fall for liberals and their lies; don't fall for liberals and their lies.

MALE VOICE. Don't feed liberals and their lies.

VOICES. Go, go, bury your lies.

MALE VOICE. We have one more speaker, Jim Thomas from the Detroit Workers Council. [Applause.]

STATEMENT OF JIM THOMAS, DETROIT WORKERS COUNCIL

Mr. THOMAS. My name is Jim Thomas. I have been working with this council ever since they started. I have been following this program and reading about it in the paper. I guess it was a week ago I read the article they had in the paper where they said 127,000 kids were entitled to this food program, but how many were getting it? About 33,000. Now I don't think this is right. It is not right for the kids; it is not right for the parents to have to pay for this; it is just not right. They come here, they hold hearings, they go back to Washington and what do they do?

MALE VOICE. Nothing.

Mr. THOMAS. They put the kids off for 2 or 3 months, they still run around in the schools hungry. What do they say to the papers? They say the kids, why feed hungry kids, make hungry kids fat? It is hard for them to learn if they are full. I think this is a bunch of crap. This is a bunch of filth.

Senator HART. All right——

Mr. THOMAS. You hold these hearings. What do they accomplish? Just like I say, they go back to Washington, they will be there for 2 or 3 months, and what do you hear about? It will be the same thing over again next year, next year. I don't see anything. You can sit there and talk all day, but if you don't do anything, you haven't accomplished nothing but wasting the people's time, the kids' time, the parents' time coming down here.

MALE VOICE. And our money.

MALE VOICE. That's right.

Mr. THOMAS. And the taxpayers' money.

MALE VOICE. Let's spend that money on food.

Mr. THOMAS. I don't see where it's right. I've got kids. With my kids, who knows? Maybe tomorrow I'll be out of work and my kids have to go to school for this free lunch. What would I do? What would these poverty kids do, these ADC mothers? They can't afford this. They can't afford it.

There is a lot I would like to say, but every time I say it, I get mad. It is not that I don't appreciate what you are trying to do, it's the way you are doing it. They come here, they're holding hearings all day, but just like I said, they go back to Washington, and what do they do? There you go. The next year it's the same thing all over again, the same thing, and I think it is a lot of people in the audience that came down today, if they got up here and talked, these people are professionals, they don't have to worry about their kids getting no programs. [Applause.]

MALE VOICE. Right.

VOICES. Right. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMAS. They live in Shaker Heights and in Cleveland, all out there, where is this getting us? They don't care, they certainly don't care; they don't care. All the West Side mothers sitting over here, these are the people, listen to the people that need this stuff, the working people. These professionals can't tell you but statistics. [Applause.]

You can't bring a 1960 census in to what's happening today. That was in 1960. That was 11 years ago. [Laughter.]

Eleven years ago, you are going to try to use it for today.

This is all I got to say. Suppose you let these West Side mothers talk?

MALE VOICE. Right. [Applause.]

Senator HART. Thank you very much, Mr. Thomas.

VOICES. We have one more.

MALE VOICE. We're not quite done yet.

FEMALE VOICE. It is an interesting thing about Senator Hart's history, I think people might like to know, and that's where his wife's family got their money.

SAME FEMALE VOICE. What we think is that people want to see us fight for food.

FEMALE VOICE. I don't want your crap either.

SAME FEMALE VOICE. He is just doing this to make himself look good. So we want the people to leave with us and make a real fight, a fight that can win, a fight that is based on the parents and the students and the Detroit schools. [Applause.]

MALE VOICE. No more hearings, we want food.

VOICES. No more hearings, we want food; no more hearings, we want food; no more hearings, we want food, come with us. No more hearings, come with us; no more hearings, come with us; no more hearings, come with us; no more hearings, come with us; no more hearings, come with us; no more hearings, come with us; no more hearings, come with us; no more hearings, come with us; no more hearings, come with us; no more hearings, come with us, no more hearings, come with us.

Senator **Hart.** They have left, but I renew my thanks to them. I know their sincerity is unquestioned and their judgment is questionable.

I would react personally only to the reference to my wife, whom I think has contributed more in the effort of feeding hungry children than any one of those earlier witnesses to whom you have just listened.

A **Voice.** We can't hear you.

Senator **Hart.** Let us take a brief recess. I am told that the PA system does not carry.

A **Voice.** No, it does not.

Senator **Hart.** We were notified of that, and we were about to do it before.

There was one figure that Mr. Briggs was going to give us. Let us get that on the record and then we will see if we can fix the PA system.

Mr. **Briggs.** The cost that was estimated in September was sixty-seven and a half cents, or about 68 cents for each lunch that was served. It included a cost of pickup and delivery of three and a half cents; service in schools of three and a half cents; milk, in addition to the lunch, of five and a half cents; the cost of unused lunches at three and a half cents, and the cost of reduced price lunches at 3 cents. That was built in to our cost factor.

Now, we used a volume price of 48 cents. This price, because of an increase in volume, is now forty-five and a half cents, so our total cost is reduced somewhat, except the only thing we are sure of at this point is that the cost of the lunches is forty-five and a half, and milk is five and a half. The cost of service on unused lunches, and so on, is not a cost we have been able to pick out of the program, except we were running close to these estimates at the last time we checked it.

Senator **Hart.** Let us recess briefly in order to see that the PA system can be adjusted in order that those in the audience can hear the testimony.

(A short recess was taken.)

Senator **Hart.** Come to order.

Our next witness is the president of the organization of school administrators and supervisors, Mr. Martin Kalish.

Apparently, if you speak right in it and are lucky, with the hum, we will be able to hear one another.

Mr. Kalish, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MARTIN KALISH, PRESIDENT, ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPERVISORS, DETROIT

Mr. **Kalish.** Senator Hart, representatives of the Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

My name is Martin Kalish, president of the Detroit Organization of School Administrators and Supervisors. I am most pleased to have this opportunity to address you regarding the school lunch program in the Detroit public schools. May I say at the outset so that there will be no misunderstanding, I do not represent the Detroit public schools. I am the president of the Detroit Organization of School Administrators and Supervisors, that organization being the sole collective bargaining agent for the 1,300 middle-management educational professionals within the Detroit public schools. I am, however, a former Detroit principal and presently on professional leave of absence to serve as the president of OSAS. So, what I have to say speaks for the 1,300 members of my organization, but not for the superintendent or the Detroit Board of Education.

The institutional history of our country is one in which the relatively self sufficient family and community has had to divest itself of responsibilities which have been gradually assumed by larger and more remote agencies. In the area of education, partial education became universal education with a compulsory requirement. This represented a quantum leap in the responsibilities of the educational establishment. After the family, the school is thought of as the most important socializing agency; not just for the child, but for the citizen.

"LET THE SCHOOL DO IT"

Our schools deliver basic cognitive skills, baby sitting services, health services—both physical and mental—and have more recently entered the area of nutrition as well. In fact, there is virtually nothing related to children that someone or other is not likely to say, "Let the school do it." But, while the wealth of the country has increased, the metropolitan schools in particular have become impoverished. The simple but direct and irrefutable explanation is that they have not been given the funds and facilities to perform the multiple duties they have assumed or been assigned.

The school lunch program has become a critical factor in the non-education of our student population. It has, additionally, taken on the valence of a sacred cow, for who could be opposed to the feeding of children in this jingoistic world? Do we not know that hungry children are poor learners? Discipline problems? And has not the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs received testimony that pre- and post-natal malnutrition is responsible for a variety of irreversible physical, mental and emotional deficiencies? Then how can professional educators do otherwise than wholeheartedly applaud and encourage broadly intended Federal assistance of nutritional problems incidentally found within the school setting?

Perhaps the answer to this last question lies in a brief review of the historical development of the elementary lunch program in one of America's largest urban school systems, Detroit, Mich.

NEW "EDUCATIONAL" OPPORTUNITY

Some years ago a Detroit superintendent of schools developed and institutionalized the quaint notion that all elementary children should have the "educational" opportunity afforded by a school lunch program. Up to that time it was generally believed that children staying for lunch were there because they needed a lunch due to indigency, because their parents were working or because they lived too far from schools. Schools had to provide a lunchroom service for these children who could not go home for one reason or another. This service was provided for the purpose of feeding children who otherwise would not be fed. Never did it occur to anyone that as we feed children we were also providing them with an "educational" experience that no child should miss. To the contrary, until this epic pronouncement by this Detroit superintendent of schools, leading child psychiatrists, psychologists and pediatricians had been saying that a break in the school day for the child to go home, to see mother was a most beneficial way to improve that child's disposition for learning. But obviously, our now departed superintendent saw something none of the rest of us had ever seen. In our mainly overage, overcrowded, undersupervised lunchrooms, he saw education.

Teachers and administrators who had taken the lunchroom duty for years saw only disaster. The daily struggle to feed more children than could be handled by the personnel and facilities available was an experience in exhaustion for both student and staff. Undaunted, this superintendent saw the beatific vision of education and piously pronounced, "Come one, come all." So came the directive—every child hereafter could stay for lunch, whether he lived across the street from school, whether mother was home or not, whether the family was rich or poor. Our already overburdened facilities and staff now had this new challenge, feed more children and also provide the educational experience decreed by the superintendent.

Now Remove Teachers

Having decreed that the lunch program was a part of the total educational learning experience available to all school children, this same superintendent now did the most amazing thing of all, he took the teachers out of the lunchroom.

By contract agreement teachers were granted a duty-free, 45 minute lunch period in the elementary schools. Now, education would have to take place without teachers and with more kids. Harried and harrassed parents were employed for 1 hour a day, first for $1.25 then $1.40, and now at the magnificent rate of $1.75 per hour and, with the principal and assistant principal, tried to maintan some semblance of order during the lunch period.

Today that superintendent of schools is gone. But what he decreed still persists: Many more children staying for lunch than can be handled by the personnel available and with the limitation of facilities. We now have exhausted children and exhausted administrators, many of whom spend one-third of the total school day supervising the lunchroom. The behavioral problems for the whole school that result from the daily breakdown of order during the lunchroom periods is now notorious. Many of our most serious school upsets originate in the lunchroom because of too many children and too little supervision. If the school lunchroom program today, without teachers to supervise and without rules limiting the number of children staying, is an experience—it is certainly not educational. It is an experience in disaster.

I submit that the elementary lunch program as it is now operated is one of the most important single causes blocking the improvement of educational quality in our schools. Children are learning in our lunchrooms, but they are learning the wrong things. The behavioral "fallout" as a result of the lunchroom situation contaminates many school programs. It is time for reexamination of the Detroit lunch program now.

OSAS has taken a hard look at the total lunch program and makes the following recommendations for your consideration:

OSAS Recommendations

(1) The Federal guidelines must return to the principal some discretion for making decisions as to whether or not a child needs to stay for lunch. Lunch should be provided only to those children needing it because of poverty. Children from homes in other programs such as ADC and welfare should not automatically be included in the free lunch program. we cannot continue to overburden our lunchroom facilities with children who have no poverty need and are remaining in school for lunch only for the convenience of the parent. The only justification for the school to provide a lunch is because the child cannot secure that lunch in any other way. The Federal program should not be the vehicle by which the parent abdicates responsibilities to children.

(2) The Federal lunch program does little for education when it provides funds essentially to cover the cost of the food without providing for facilities and equipment. The impossibility of feeding children in present facilities must be obvious to anyone who has ever been in a Detroit elementary school. To continue to press funds on us for food but leaving us to feed children in old auditoriums, playrooms, classrooms and hallways does a disservice.

(3) The Federal guidelines must include financial provision for adequately trained lunchroom supervisors. The amount of money allowed previously under Federal guidelines is totally inadequate to employ the quality of people needed to effectively supervise the lunchroom program. Coupling this fact with the lack of availability of teachers to perform this function, it is obvious that we need paraprofessionals of high enough quality to perform the duties of this important and demanding job. The persons that we have employed, even at the $1.75 rate have, in too many cases, been inadequate to the task.

So, in conclusion, may I suggest to you as strongly as I can that you take a look at the Federal program and find ways to restrict it only to those in actual need, as well as provide the funds necessary to build the facilities, purchase the equipment, and hire trained high-quality lunchroom supervision. Unless you do this, we must conclude that the present elementary lunch program as operated under the Federal guidelines, is a hindrance rather than an educational help.

Senator Hart, I thank you.

Senator Hart. Thank you.

You would oppose the program even if Federal funds had created adequate eating facilities and provided trained and competent supervisory personnel?

Mr. Kalish. My opposition, Senator, would be similar to the opposition of the first speaker. There are better ways, obviously, to deliver services to children than through the schools. My position would be that ADC and welfare programs or guaranteed annual wage, whatever, should provide the opportunity for parents to feed their children at home. Given that impossibility of it at this time, the nonavailability of it, we cannot continue to live with an impossible situation which resides in the fact that we don't have the facilities to adequately feed children. So, if you cannot move in the direction of moving feeding back to parents, to other programs, then you must provide the millions of dollars that are necessary to building the facilities so that we in the schools can treat children humanely, and we are not treating them humanely.

Senator Hart. That is the point I want to get clear. You do support the school lunch program, provided the facilities, and supervisory personnel that are necessary are there?

Mr. Kalish. And providing that we still keep in mind the guaranteed annual wage, or some other form of income to parents so finally that responsibility for feeding children does, in fact, go back to parents.

Purpose of ADC Program

Senator, I submit to you that the ADC program was created for the purpose of having parent and child together, and certainly the ADC program, in its funding, ought to be funding the parents' right to feed the child at lunch. I submit to you it is rare to find an ADC child in the whole city of Detroit that does not stay for lunch. What we continue to do is put on the schools a social burden. Certainly hungry children need to be fed, but what I am saying to you, the school is not the place to do this if we can find a better delivery service, and there are better ones, but in the meantime, if we have to continue this, we cannot continue it in basements, we cannot continue it in roach-infested classrooms after the lunch period, we cannot continue to operate it. I don't know where you intend to eat lunch today, but I would invite you to eat a free lunch at my expense, in an elementary school today at noon, so you yourself can see what a 70-year-old building can offer to children at lunch time.

Senator Hart. I am told we did have an offer to have such a lunch, and I hope our schedule will permit us to take you up on the offer.

We do agree, not happily, that while neither will come into being in the next few days, it is much more likely that we would allocate the money for facilities and personnel to operate a lunch program than to establish nationally an adequate minimum income for every family. Given that unhappy assumption, you support the increase in funding to establish adequate facilities within which lunch can be served, and the training and employment of personnel competent to supervise the lunch program?

Mr. KALISH. Yes, sir.

Senator HART. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. CASSIDY. No questions.

Senator HART. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. KINNEY. I have one comment here.

Mr. Kalish, you mention that due to the fact that very likely it will be an impossibility to feed children at home at the present time, you point out the fact that most AFDC children remain in school, but you support the concept of having the child return home where there is a possibility of him receiving some food at home. You also pointed up one of the reasons for establishing AFDC programs is to keep the children together. Now, how do you feel about the new move or requiring AFDC mothers or ADC mothers to sign up for work or training? This looks like a move to separate the child and the parent, rather than what you propose to do in the family assistance program.

Mr. KALISH. Really, I don't think I should comment on that. It is a separate political issue. My point is as long as we have the ADC program, and I personally think it is a sound approach, that approach being an educational approach, in my estimation a child gets the most out of leaving the school, going home at noon, seeing mother, having a lunch at home. I would hope that perhaps it will turn out that it would be much cheaper, and I haven't diagnosed this one, but it may be millions of dollars cheaper to give to ADC mothers and welfare mothers increases, more food stamps, so they could adequately provide the lunches than it will be to build the facilities in the school.

Look at Alternative Systems

I think you need to look at the alternative systems. In my estimation it would cost us much less. You see, what you are dealing with in a large city is an elementary school building program. We have buildings up to a hundred years old. Our forefathers never intended to serve lunch. When you come in there and try to get a facility in, you are not talking about $5,000, you may be talking about a million dollars in a single school. You put all the millions together, and it may be a lot cheaper to do something in the ADC and welfare.

Now, mother is supposed to be home as ADC is now constituted. She isn't supposed to be working, she is supposed to be there to take care of her children, and I think many ADC mothers would welcome that opportunity, but they don't have that now, because they insist they are underbudgeted, and they probably are, I have no way of knowing. I would ask the committee to take a look at the relative cost of delivering the service, which we all agree it must be delivered, but only if it can be delivered best, most efficiently and economically to the school system, that is the question. I would submit to you there are many things that enter into this, that interfere with learning in children, and hunger is one of them, bad eyesight is another, a drunken mother is another; a father who beats them is another, so we don't come to the store in each and every instance of what interferes with learning. You say now we put a psychiatrist on the staff, now a doctor, and so on. We have designed other delivery systems for those services, and I say to you that with the situation that we face in Detroit, the kind of money that is involved to make these schools a decent place to eat would be so great that we probably would be better off looking to another delivery service system.

Mr. Kinney. What is your position on using the ADC mother, training that mother to come into the school system, to where the child happens to be, to supervising these programs?

Mr. Kalish. Well, in many of our programs, many of our parent professional programs, not only in the lunch program, but various Federal programs, many welfare and ADC mothers have been employed in the school. Some can do it, some can't. Some have other younger children which does not permit them to leave the home. So, there are many complications, but only if efforts are made in any of the parent special programs to use the parents from that neighborhood to work in these programs.

The little demonstration you saw here today, Senator Hart, may be somewhat disturbing. I would tell you we have many such demonstrations in the schools every day, many serious ones that result in violence and injuries, and many times, as was truly said, it revolves around the issue of food in the schools. We know we are doing a lousy job of delivering food, we grant you that, but I operated last week at a junior high school where we were using the converted auditorium as a lunchroom. We had 1,400 children and we could only seat 200 in the lunchroom at one time. We started our lunch period at 10 minutes to 10 in the morning, and we ended at 20 minutes after 1 in the afternoon. During all that time you had children marching back and forth, cleanup problem. Really, we weren't running a school, we were running a restaurant.

School Function Is To Educate

The basic function of the school is to educate. Maybe we need to look at the alternative systems for doing some of the other things that need to be done. Whenever we have a social problem in the schools, when too many children were killing themselves with the cars, we made the decision that the schools would have to teach driver education. Then we get drugs, and then what are the schools going to do for us? The schools can't do everything. We educators are the first to admit this, and I say to you we are being overburdened to the point that we are unable to function in what we are supposed to do, and that is educating children, and this is nothing about appreciating the need to feed hungry kids. I want to feed them, but in a better way than we are able to do now.

Mr. Kinney. Thank you very much.

Senator Hart. Thank you very much. Mr. Kalish.

I think our next witness who was mentioned by Mrs. Mahaffey in her opening statement, we welcome from the Merrill-Palmer Institute, Mrs. Muriel Wagner.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MURIEL WAGNER, MERRILL-PALMER INSTITUTE, DETROIT

Mrs. Wagner. Thank you very much.

I would like to read my prepared statement.

This committee has heard voluminous testimony concerning the multifaceted problems of hunger and undernutrition in the United States from the scientific community and concerned citizens. Research directions, proposed new food programs, critiques of existing programs, supportive data for the incidence of undernutrition and the interrelationship of food and good nutrition to the social-cultural, physical, and psychological well-being of infants, children, teenagers, pregnant women, adults, and elderly people in the United States have been exhaustively and relentlessly reviewed and pursued. I would like to warmly welcome you to Detroit and to say "thank you" for giving us the opportunity to explore the dimensions of the school lunch program of critical import to Detroit children.

You are also familiar with the clinical effects of undernutrition in American children which are manifested in delayed physical growth and maturation. These effects are well documented in the nutritional literature from the classical studies in the 1930's of Spies, Mann, and Dreizen to the geographically fragmented reports of the recently completed new survey.

But to give more immediate geographic focus to such effects, I would like to share the results of an unpublished study of the effects of the race and environment on the height, weight, and skeletal development of 8-year-old children. These data were collected at the Merrill-Palmer Institute on 480 8-year-old children attending schools in the Metropolitan Detroit area from 1962 to 1965. The heights, weights, and skeletal development of the children were grouped according to race, Negro and Caucasian, sex, and socioeconomic group level. The criterion used for socioeconomic group determination was the parental grade level completed. There were no significant differences in ages between the groups of children; the range of age being between 95.73 months and 96.42 months.

Our analyses revealed significant differences in height and weight due to socioeconomic groups rather than race. That is, children belonging to the lower socioeconomic group, both boys and girls, were significantly shorter and lighter than their middle-class socioeconomic group counterparts. It should be emphasized that this finding held regardless of race. With regard to skeletal development, each lower socioeconomic group lagged behind the corresponding middle-class socioeconomic group, again regardless of sex or race.

ENVIRONMENT IS THE CRUCIAL VARIANT

Thus, environment is highlighted as a crucial variable in the physical development of these Detroit children. Environmental influences can be spelled out as (a) nutrition which provides the raw materials for growth and development, and (b) medical care which prevents childhood illnesses from interfering with growth progress.

These results coupled with inferences from other reports dealing with the effect of nutrition on mental development, attention span, and psychological functioning of the child strongly support efforts to ameliorate the nutritional milieu of the low-income child. Not only should a school lunch be made readily available and accessible to every child in Detroit, but school breakfast programs must also be instituted. The one-third of the recommended dietary allowances supplied by some school lunch program, unless augmented by other meals, is, in itself, not enough to provide for full expression of the child's growth potential where there may exist significant deficiencies.

In addition to the foregoing, I would like to highlight two areas related to the school lunch programs. The first concerns the regulations pertaining to these programs. In one school lunch program, for example, department regulations require that white milk be a part of the lunch. Many children do not drink the milk; many do not even open the cartons. The carton of milk is placed on the tray, then discarded, since it cannot be used in food preparation even if it is unopened. Chocolate milk, cheese, or milk puddings apparently are not considered valid substitutes, even though they may be nutritionally comparable and actually consumed. Another incident relates to the serving of enriched crackers and whole rye wafers as a bread and cereal substitute under the special food program for children. This was an unacceptable substitute for cereals or bread, even though the crackers may have been nutritionally similar to the stipulated bread or cereal and eaten in greater quantities.

NUTRITIONISTS READY TO HELP

The second and last point pertains to the educational benefits of a school lunch program reenforced by nutrition education experiences for the child. Children are learning to eat for a lifetime, daily. Is it possible that greens cooked and eaten with the lean of a ham hock and a slab of corn bread might be an adequate substitute for macaroni and cheese and buttered spinach? The psychological value of recognizing sociocultural differences in food patterns perhaps helps a child bridge the gap between the family dinner table and the seemingly old, impersonal, school food service. Teachers, although overburdened, need assistance with ways of integrating nutrition to their curriculum. Nutritionists in Detroit are ready and eager to help interpret their disciplines.

The nutritional needs of people are becoming an object lesson in gamesmanship. The new food stamp regulations and the failure to raise adequate funds to expand the desperately needed supplemental food program for pregnant women and nursing mothers are additional cases in point. The unequalness and inequities of the school lunch program make children pawns in this game; their physical and psychological development the stakes.

I thank you.

Senator HART. Thank you very much.

I think, while we have not, while I have not been able to stay even with your reading of this, because it involves elements of which I am so unfamiliar, one useful purpose served by this study that you give us relates not just to the necessity for insuring that the children are, but response to the still broadly entertained notion that race is the determining factor in so many things, and your study simply destroys that notion.

Mrs. WAGNER. Environment is a far more crucial factor.

Senator HART. I am told by staff that there is no prohibition as far as the school lunch program in the Department of Agriculture against the use of chocolate milk.

Mrs. WAGNER. This, I feel, has to do with the interpretations of the regulations of the school lunch programs. And, perhaps, this is due to an individual school, and it may be an idiosyncratic kind of thing.

Senator HART. It may be, and we should determine that some State rule or city regulation has narrowed the Federal Department's authorization used on both white and chocolate milk. Certainly we ought to find out and be sure there is a very clear understanding in all areas, that it is not required that you provide white milk to be thrown away.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. CASSIDY. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HART. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. KINNEY. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HART. Well, Merrill-Palmer has done many significant things, and it is a magnificent history, and I am sure this unpublished study, now published, will be one. When it is coming out?

Mrs. WAGNER. We expect it to be published within a year.

Senator HART. Thank you very much.

Mrs. WAGNER. Thank you.

Senator HART. I am advised we will recess at this point to resume at 1:30 p.m.

(Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p.m., the same day.)

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1971—AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator **Hart**. If there is no objection, although it is not yet quite 1:30, we will resume.

I hear no objection.

The first witness scheduled for this afternoon is the president of the Detroit Federation of Teachers, Mary Ellen Riordan. I noticed she was here, but is not present at this moment.

I wonder is we could then proceed to hear Mrs. Erlaine Taylor of the field annex schools.

Is Mrs. Mary Moseley here?

Is Mrs. Shirley McCoy, the education consultant for food service here?

Mrs. **McCoy**. I am here.

Senator **Hart**. Are you ready to come on now?

Mrs. **McCoy**. Yes; sure.

Senator **Hart**. Mrs. McCoy.

STATEMENT OF MRS. SHIRLEY B. McCOY, SCHOOL FOOD PROGRAMS CONSULTANT, WAYNE COUNTY INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT, DETROIT, MICH.

Mrs. **McCoy**. Senator Hart and members of the committee, This is a great opportunity for me to appear before you today.

I have been working with school lunch programs in Michigan for 20 years. Fifteen years were spent in the Waterford Township School District in Oakland County. The past 4½ years have been with the Wayne County Intermediate School District.

Mr. Cassidy, I think perhaps those of us in the intermediate school district need to explain our role as far as our connection with the State and local district. I think we act as a liaison group or organization that brings information from the State to the local school district. My job is that of a school lunch consultant or school food program consultant, as I call myself. One of my responsibilities is to evaluate school lunch programs in the districts in Wayne County.

I have been concerned chiefly with the 36 school districts in the county outside of the city of Detroit. Of course you have had full testimony from Mr. Briggs this morning.

In these 36 districts there are 410 schools. You might like to insert, in these 410 schools there are 300,000 students, and these 410 schools are public schools. Two hundred and forty of these have school lunch programs. This leaves 170 schools without school lunch programs. One hundred and forty-three of these are elementary schools. Fifteen of these 143 have breakfast programs. Five of these breakfast programs are in the Inkster School District, where a free breakfast is served in the classroom each day by teachers and students to every child. Classes begin with breakfast.

THREE YEARS TO INITIATE PROGRAM

It took 3 years of effort to initiate this program. The district was operating on funds borrowed from the State department of education. The superintendent was in favor of some kind of food program for the elementary children, but there wasn't a penny available in the district budget. We were able to obtain some funds available for breakfast programs under the Child Nutrition Act, so began a program for 30 special education students in the Carver Elementary School in November 1969, operating it from the Wayne County Intermediate School District.

This is quite a departure from the usual thing because in order to get anything going at all the superintendent didn't feel he could stick his neck out to any extent to start a program, not having any money to do so.

As more money became available in 1970 for these kinds of programs, they have expanded to include 1,500 students daily in five elementary schools in the Inkster School District.

We also, in that same district, have a program operating in the vocational education section, a food service program, and the students in the food service program are preparing lunch, a school lunch program, under the instruction of teachers. This is a departure, too, from the ordinary way of doing the school lunch program.

We could tell a similar story for the programs in Hamtramck, River Rouge, Romulus, and Westwood. They were initiated because of local interest, along with assistance from the State level.

We are aware and deeply concerned that we have 130 or more elementary schools without school lunch programs or breakfast programs. About one-half of these schools are in the so-called deprived areas. There are needy children in the so-called deprived areas. There are needy children in every school district. I regret that the attention is focused on the needy children in specified areas. To reach every child and to avoid discrimination, our goal is to initiate food programs in all of these schools. Food and nutrition education is meaningful and applicable for preschool and elementary schoolage children.

You are asking why these children are not being reached. I might refer to a statement reported by one of your staff members which states that schools are focused on teacher contracts, order, discipline, and classroom procedures, and that some administrators feel that school lunch adds another burden to the school system that is already breaking down.

It would be easy to blame others for failure to reach the children, but we as school food service administrators, dietitians, and nutritionists must share the responsibility since we have not convinced too many people that food and nutrition is worthy of high priority.

In Michigan, we have not interpreted to the public to any extensive degree the significance of the national nutrition survey, indicating that the prevalence of malnutrition in the children in the Michigan schools is a serious problem.

REASONS FOR UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPT

Some of the reasons for our unsuccessful attempts to initiate programs are:

(1) Reluctance of school administrators to any kind of change. Some administrators are near retirement; some are new to the district; some are contemplating change of positions. This may indicate some instability in Wayne County. I am sure this is true;

(2) Lack of interest on the part of some school administrators, school staff, students, parents, and the community. People are not convinced that we have hungry children nor is it their responsibility;

(3) Lack of funds to budget for school feeding programs;

(4) Lack of facilities; can't serve food in classrooms, too smelly; cost of supervision is too great; too much work for custodians;

(5) Failure of millage increases to operate "essential" school programs.

The national School Lunch Act of 1946 made provision for the sponsors to supply lunches without cost or at reduced price to all children unable to pay. The agreement did not say who would pay for these free lunches. So many districts had the children work for part of their lunch period in return for the free lunch. School districts did not have policies on free or reduced priced lunches until it became mandatory in 1968. Since then free and reduced priced lunches have increased threefold, especially since December 1970.

A spokesman for the USDA Food and Nutrition Service states that the actual cost of lunches now average 62.2 cents. In Wayne County, Mich., lunches average or exceed this cost in many cases. Except for a few specified areas, most districts are receiving a maximum of 35 cents in cash for each free or reduced priced lunch and 5 cents cash for paid lunch. The charge for type A lunches ranges from 25 cents to 50 cents. The donated commodities add a value of about 10 cents per lunch. This comes a long way, really, toward covering the cost of the food or for serving a lunch.

One of the problems in Wayne County with the 36 districts with which I am associated, we have about 24 districts that are maybe just on the fringes of needing help. Maybe you don't qualify for a type A lunch in every case, but we do have families that need the lunch at a reduced cost.

Districts are now saying that they cannot feed every needy child or continue the type A lunch program unless they receive reimbursement and aid that covers the complete cost of the meal.

Michigan differs from other states in that there is no State contribution to the school lunch program. Many other States do make contributions. Michigan must provide matching funds by fiscal year 1972 if we are to continue to participate in the national school lunch program. This is our hope for reaching all needy children.

Senator, I do not agree with your statement that "Everyone recognizes that learning ability is directly related to nutrition". If this were true, perhaps more educators would have established a philosophy concerning the relationship of food and nutrition education to health and to the school curriculum. Such a philosophy, when put into action, relates directly to the school lunch and breakfast programs, since they serve as a laboratory for the practice of what is being learned in the classroom.

I would like to just insert here teachers don't necessarily have to be with the children when they have lunch, but they could teach them things in the classroom, show how it is related to the lunch and any other school food service or breakfast. I might add when the day begins with the breakfast, the teachers integrate this breakfast program into their classroom work, and I have an article which I would like to read a little bit later, some evaluation of the breakfast programs.

Students might discover the pertinence of the National Nutrition Survey, if we had a program of nutrition and health education in the school.

NEED FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS

As school food service people, we have a lot to do in public relations:

Even within individual school buildings we need to take time to let everyone know what we are trying to accomplish and extend this information to the parents and community;

School administrators need to be sold on the value of the school lunch program as an educational tool to enrich the curriculum;

Students and teachers must be involved in the operation and evaluation of the program;

Parents may be reached by inviting them to the school to observe the program, including the food preparation and to eat lunch with the children;

We can get the school lunch story to the general public through the news media that are readily available as a public service.

I am sure that the Michigan department of education has definite goals for the school lunch program in Michigan.

My personal feeling is that food and nutrition is a vital part of living from birth until death and that nutrition education programs in schools and nutrition information to the public become a common goal for all of us that have felt the need for this emphasis.

It would follow that nutrition education would become a requirement for teacher certification. We might begin immediately by sponsoring nutrition education courses for our classroom teachers. Additional research in the areas of individual food consumption and human nutritional needs will continue to support our existing knowledge of the extent of malnutrition among our people.

We are fortunate that Dr. John Porter, superintendent of the Michigan department of education, supports the school lunch program in our State.

Mr. William Shunck, superintendent of the Wayne County intermediate school district, is keenly aware of the value of nutrition education in the school curriculum.

I thank you.

Senator Hart. Thank you, Mrs. McCoy.

I think you have identified in the five numbered sentences, which begin at the bottom of page 2, why we find so many schools without a school lunch program and why so many children who, on an economic basis, apparently are eligible are not being fed. This isn't blaming anybody, it is just describing human nature, reluctance to any kind of change. That is the mark of a human, whether he is a school administrator or anything else. Some people really don't believe there are hungry children and then if the child is pointed out to them it is somebody else's job to feed them, because the parent is irresponsible or, in any event, people are not convinced we have hungry children nor is it their responsibility, although everybody agrees no child should be hungry.

EXTENT OF MALNUTRITION UNKNOWN

Mrs. McCoy. I don't think we realize the extent of our malnutrition, though. I think if we had more studies in local districts of what children are actually eating, I have done some of this work but not to any great extent, but I was able to point out to some administrators, especially at the secondary level, that 80 percent of the high school students did not eat any breakfast, so this is really true and this was in a semiaffluent community.

Senator Hart. You remind us that there was the National Nutrition Survey and it shows the high percentage of malnutrition in Michigan and it is a serious problem.

Your third point is lack of funds, money, and your fourth is corollary, I suppose, lack of facilities.

Mrs. McCoy. I think I would like to make the statement, too, I think there is a fear, especially in our school districts that have never had any kind of a food program, I know, in the districts we were able to go into, to start something for the first time. There was much more confidence when they knew you would actually go in there and help them get started. But there is a fear that it is something new, you see.

Senator Hart. Mr. Cassiday.

Mr. Cassidy. No questions, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Senator Hart. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. Beckham. No questions.

Mr. Kinney. I have one comment, Mr. Chairman.

You strongly recommend an educational program on nutrition, is that correct?

Mrs. McCoy. Oh, definitely. I think it is a necessity.

Mr. Kinney. What do you think the cost of such a program, a comprehensive program, would be?

Mrs. McCoy. I couldn't tell you that, but I think our classroom teachers are going to be the greatest influence to get a program in nutrition, and I think we could give them some nutrition education courses in the summertime that would be available to them without cost to them.

Mr. Kinney. You are talking about teachers now?

Mrs. McCoy. Yes.

Mr. Kinney. What about the students?

Mrs. McCoy. Cost to the student?

What About Educational Nutrient Program?

Mr. Kinney. What about a comprehensive program, educational program, in nutrition for the students?

Mrs. McCoy. Well, I would think that this could be worked into the curriculum without any great cost. I mean why couldn't it be part of the health education?

Mr. Kinney. That is my question, why isn't it a part of the health education program? I know to some extent it is being covered, but I guess these things are going to have to go together. We are going to have to find some way to make an education process, you know, take advantage of educational opportunities that are available in the whole school program.

In your opinion, would such a program include training of children on table manners and things of this nature or just nutrition as your statement said?

Mrs. McCoy. Well, I think both.

Mr. Kinney. The reason why I am concerned about this is that I think most schools or most people will agree when we go through an educational process the end result of that particular process is to maintain some kind of livelihood in this country. I mean it is geared toward earning a living, making a place in the community for your kids and your family. And it has been my experience that in business and industry and in working situations that a lot has to do with the social graces that you have in a working situation. I think we need to start a very early life in this kind of training.

Mrs. McCoy. I think so, too. I think one of my statements I made is most applicable in preschool and in early elementary. This seems to me where we have had a great deal of success. And in the Headstart programs there has been a lot of good things done in that area with interested people who want to make food, and just experiences with food available to these children.

Mr. Kinney. How much time do you think it would take, I mean how long, are we talking about 3 weeks', 2 weeks', training for teachers in the summer, or how much time are we talking about?

Mrs. McCoy. I would think the training that would be equivalent to a term, it could be as little as a summer, 3 weeks. You can get quite a bit done in a comprehensive course of that kind. Now, this summer something is being offered at the University of Wisconsin for a school food service administrator function which is federally funded. This kind of thing will be marvelous. But, you know, school lunch administrators may be able to do a little bit in the classroom, as I understand. But it is the classroom teacher who is doing it every day and works it in, and everything that has to do with the curriculum and it can be worked in that style.

Mr. Kinney. Let me congratulate you on this very attractive folder in which you put your presentation.

Mrs. McCoy. Thank you.

Mr. **Kinney**. That is usually the way to tell that good things begin.

Senator **Hart**. Mrs. McCoy, thank you very much.

Mrs. **McCoy**. You are welcome.

Senator **Hart**. Is Miss Vera Jehnsen, the food service director of the Oakland county school, here?

Miss **Jehnsen**. Yes, I am here.

Senator **Hart**. Miss Jehnsen.

STATEMENT OF MISS VERA JEHNSEN, DIRECTOR, SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES, OAKLAND SCHOOLS, PONTIAC, MICH., ACCOMPANIED BY MRS. ADELAIDE TIRRELL, PRESIDENT, MICHIGAN SCHOOLS SERVICE ASSOCIATION, BIRMINGHAM, MICH.

Miss **Jehnsen**. Senator Hart.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

Mrs. Adelaide Tirrell, president of the Michigan Schools Service Association, which is the professional organization for food service personnel of the State of Michigan, is seated at the table with me.

Senator **Hart**. Mrs. Tirrell, welcome.

Miss **Jehnsen**. I take this opportunity to thank you for allowing me to testify on the operation of the school lunch program in Michigan. I am Vera Jehnsen, food service director for Oakland schools.

Oakland schools is the intermediate school district in Oakland County, which services 28 local school districts. In Oakland County schools there are 373 public schools, 238,322 pupils in grades kindergarten to 12, 256 school lunch programs, approximately 60,000 average lunches daily, approximately $8 million plus yearly gross school lunch income.

I cite these statistics to point out the school lunch program is an important factor in the economic climate of the community, a fact which, by the way, oftentimes is overlooked.

Any additions to my prepared statement are for purposes of clarification. I would emphasize I have remained in school lunch for the past 21 years because I believe in the basic philosophy of school lunch programs. I offer my comments as food for thought. The committee is here for 2 days of hearings in an effort to hasten the implementation of free or reduced price lunches for all children.

I subscribe most vehemently to the theory that "a hungry child can't learn" and that our goal should be to "wipe out hunger". I seriously question, however, the methods used to attempt to reach the goal. To blame all of the problems of the school lunch program on a lack of funds is ignoring some basic problems which must be resolved. More money alone will not solve the following:

Problems Money Can't Solve

(1) The school lunch program must teach and be part of the child's education in order to be accepted by school administrators, faculty, and the community. Nutrition education is not just feeding but should be a program to teach the whys and hows of good eating habits;

(2) The school lunch program as it is currently operated in Michigan is a welfare program which has been foisted on the education

program. And before I am charged with heresy and deserting my own field, let me insert I make the statement to point up a need to gain acceptance of the program so that we in the food service area can concentrate on needy children. Certainly there is no objection to feeding the needy (as I expect the school facilities will eventually be utilized to feed the elderly), but the responsibility for identifying the needy and funding the needy rightfully belongs in the area of welfare. The schools should make available to all children an attractive, nutritionally well-balanced lunch at minimum cost. The schools can have within their power and facilities such that they can teach good food selection, good nutrition, good food purchasing, and good food preparation as part of the school lunch curriculum. The function of schools is to educate, and the school lunch efforts must be directed to that end;

(3) The feeding of the needy will be accomplished only if there is a healthy ongoing "parent" program in the district. If the parent program fails because of a lack of money and support, the goal to feed the needy children fails also;

(4) The reimbursement payments formula (section 210.11d of the regulations), as applied in Michigan this school year, has not been equitable. Districts eligible for maximum special assistance can receive 60 cents for free lunches while those districts whose main source of income is derived from sale of lunches have been held to a maximum return of 49 cents (45 cents from the child and 4 cents reimbursement). In a few districts, permission was obtained from the State office to charge 50 cents for a type A lunch. This maximum reimbursement amount has been increased 1 cent beginning in April 1971. These districts, which do not receive maximum reimbursement on the basis of need, are supposed to operate on 6 cents to 11 cents less per lunch than is allowed for each needy lunch. In these same districts which do not qualify for maximum special assistance, each free lunch served in September, October, and November returned 24 cents (20 cents plus 4 cents) on a lunch which cost from 60 to 64 cents to serve. From December through March, each free lunch in these districts returned 34 cents (30 cents plus 4 cents) on a 60–64-cent lunch. I point out these figures by way of the financial duress of most school districts in Oakland County at this time.

REVISED REGULATIONS NEED DEFINITION

Implementation of the school lunch regulations as revised in September 1970 has been very difficult because information and direction have been so minimal. The new regulations have had a schizophrenic effect on most school administrators. On one hand, I sincerely do believe that the school administrators do want to make sure there is not a hungry child, but I can appreciate, on the other hand, they are working within a strict budget for the district educational programs.

Changes must be made in the method of operating the school lunch program in Michigan. Moneys must be distributed so all children benefit. The school lunch program must be an integral part of the educational system. We must fill the minds as well as the stomachs of our school children.

Senator Hart. Mrs. Tirrell, is there something you would like to add there?

Mrs. Tirrell. I would just like to say, speaking for our organization, the Michigan Schools Food Service Association in Michigan, that we fully support the belief that every child in Michigan should have a lunch at school. This isn't possible without more Federal financial support and/or State support. It seems at this point in 1971 that parents are unwilling or unable or uninterested in paying the 60 cents per meal cost. This means more groundwork in apprising the parents and children of the need for nutrition education.

All children in the State of Michigan, outstate, Detroit, Pontiac, Birmingham, they all need a well-balanced meal in whatever income group they are in. Part of the problem is a question of whose responsibility it is to provide nutritious meals for schoolchildren, is it the home, is it the school, or is it the community. Until this is made clear, Michigan schools food service had a difficult time interpreting Federal regulations.

Senator Hart. What is your address?

Mrs. Tirrell. Birmingham School District.

Senator Hart. You make the point, Mrs. Jehnsen, that money alone won't solve the problem, and it is a point that ought to be made. I am usually making the point that prayer and good work alone won't solve it, either. But you have introduced a balance of your own there.

MECHANICS OF PROGRAM CAUSING BOG-DOWN

Miss Jehnsen. Yes, if I may interject there, yes, money will help a great deal, there is no doubt about it. I think that some of the other problems, and I don't intend to sound like a heretic, but I think some of the implementation problems, some of the mechanics of putting this program into effect, are causing a bog-down. The mere process of identifying students and communicating with the community in this area, I think we have heard in the last day and a half of testimony reference to this item by school administrators and faculty members, that this is a problem they feel is time-consuming and detracts from their other educational program. If you can find some solution to alleviate this problem, I think it would help a great deal in gaining acceptance so we can get on with the job of feeding them.

Senator Hart. Mrs. Tirrell addressed the question who is responsible for feeding the children.

And you said it is the home——

Mrs. Tirrell. School, or the community.

Senator Hart. I suppose we agree the perfect place would be the home?

Mrs. Tirrell. In some instances but not in all.

Senator Hart. In the perfect world, all those instances would be gone, but it is because we will never be in a perfect world and it is because there are an enormous number of those instances that we next turn to the school. You would make a point even in the all-perfect world that nutritional education ought to be a subject included and with some measure of emphasis in the school?

Mrs. Tirrell. Yes.

Senator Hart. Does the school lunch program represent an activity which is essential to teach nutrition?

Mrs. Tirrell. Yes, if the school lunch program is presented in the way in which the original intent was, and that doesn't mean that we have Coke machines, pop machines, potato chips, and candy available to children at any hour during the day. This is one of the big problems in any school lunch program, in any district, affluent or otherwise, the pressure of student groups, administrative groups, in some instances the commercial vendors, insisting that money can be made from the sale of such items, which furnish only calories to the detriment of a well-planned type A lunch or any other part of a type A lunch.

Senator Hart. I would assume that that is a problem that is more acute in the schools where poverty is less identifiable?

Miss Jehnsen. I would assume, yes; I would go on the assumption, yes.

Senator Hart. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Hart. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. Beckham. No questions.

Senator Hart. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. Kinney. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Hart. Thank you very much.

Miss Jehnsen. Thank you.

Senator Hart. Is Mrs. Erlaine Taylor of the Field Annex Schools here?

Mrs. Taylor.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ERLAINE M. TAYLOR, HOME CURRICULUM SPECIALIST, FIELD AND FIELD ANNEX SCHOOLS, NEIGHBORHOOD EDUCATION CENTER, DETROIT, MICH.

Mrs. Taylor. I want to thank you, Senator Hart, for your interest in the poor, the hungry children, and we are grateful for this opportunity to speak.

Senator Hart. This rig is tough. If you pull that just a little closer or lean into it a little.

Mrs. Taylor. Can you hear me now?

Senator Hart. Yes.

Mrs. Taylor. The school lunch program as it is presently administered is definitely inequitable. Inequities exist because the guidelines which are used to determine who shall have free lunch and who shall pay a reduced price for lunch are excessively stringent and unrealistic. As an example, to qualify for free lunch a family of four must have a gross income not exceeding $47 per week. Thus, access to a free lunch is limited to those children whose families are at the lowest extreme of the income scale. To qualify for the reduced price lunch a family of four must have an income not greater than $66.25 per week. A family of four in a depressed area where blacks predominate is usually comprised of a mother and three children. Lunches for these children at the reduced price will cost 45 cents per school day. A trained nutritionist would find it difficult, perhaps impossible, to provide well-balanced meals on the allowable income of the guidelines, which incomes must also pay for clothing, shelter, utilities, food, medical, and other needs. The families to whom the guidelines apply are not experts. In general, they are the least educated, least knowledgable, least healthy, and least able to make what little money they do have do the impossible.

MANY NEEDIEST MISS FREE LUNCH

Additionally, many children who need free lunch do not get it because their parents either do not apply or fail to give required information on the family data sheet. Often these people are, sometimes, I should say, illiterate, they don't wish to admit their illiteracy, therefore they put down whatever they think or what someone tells them they should. Sometimes they don't understand the check isn't weekly, it is biweekly, and sometimes they aren't concerned with the privilege they have of applying for free lunch.

Conversely, parents who are more sophisticated give the information which they know will make their children eligible for free or reduced price lunches. Therefore, I think the schools in communities assessed as poverty areas should be enabled to provide free lunch to all students. The elimination of the need to prove eligibility would serve a dual purpose: first, it would insure that all children in these schools get lunch, and, second, it would relieve families of the necessity to reveal income. The family data sheet was certainly not so designed, but is, in effect, one more device which strips the poor of dignity and privacy. The onus of having to lay bare one's financial status to school personnel does not tend to promote meaningful and harmonious school-community interaction.

The lunches served in the schools, although nutritionally well balanced, are frequently unpalatable to the children for whom they are planned. Also, where there are not proper facilities in large enough kitchens, the food that is brought into sattelite schools is often only hot for the first perhaps 100 children, after that it tends to be cool or, in some instances, cold. Thus, much food is wasted by that segment of our population which needs it most. Children also tend to shun unfamiliar foods. This indicates that effort must be made to plan menus which will be attractive to children, without loss of sound nutrition. Also indicated is a need for parent education concerning food, nutrition, and low cost menus.

Supervision of children who lunch in school is a serious problem. Administrators ordinarily assume responsibility for noon hour supervision assisted by noon hour aides. There may be only four or five aides and one administrator to supervise four to five hundred children. There is, of course, here a safety factor involved. Obviously there is a need to employ a greater number of noon aides. They should be paid more than the $1.75 per hour they presently earn to assure dependability and good job performance. Orientation programs and/or job training is desirable to increase their effectiveness.

PLEASANT, UNHURRIED LUNCH NOT POSSIBLE

The numbers of children participating in the school lunch program necessitates having children eat in shifts inasmuch as schools do not have dining areas sufficient to accommodate all lunchers at one sitting. Thus a pleasant, unhurried luncheon for the majority of school lunchers is not possible. Outdoor play areas are often too small or nonexistent so that appropriate activities are severely curtailed. It may be that where school facilities are grossly inadequate the lunch program could be housed outside the school setting in a building central to the school community.

Malnutrition is a serious problem in our society. The school lunch program is commendable as one means of preventing the development of nutritional deficiencies. However, the program needs to be expanded to include all children who need this service.

I would like to add that very often children from poor families come from homes where conditions are such that the family does not come together for an evening meal in the sense that we understand it, and therefore it is very important that they be able to eat lunch in a pleasant, relaxed climate, and this lunchtime is one way to provide that meal that they can enjoy.

Thank you.

Senator **Hart.** Mrs. Taylor, how long have you been observing the school lunch program at Detroit?

Mrs. **Taylor.** I taught 15 years and for the last 2 years I have been employed as a home curriculum specialist, which means I not only see the program at school but I also visit homes from which these children come.

Senator **Hart.** Your suggestions, without exception, are very thoughtful. Towards the very end you mentioned something that has occurred to me occasionally and to others before us. When you have a school, when we say there are a number of schools that lack facilities but some lack it more than others, when you have one that is just loaded to the gills with children, classroom use consumes everything with maybe temporary classrooms built in the back somewhere, you say the lunch program could be housed outside the school setting in a building central to the school community. Is there in Detroit any such building outside the school where school lunches are being served? Perhaps it isn't even permitted under the law, I don't know.

Mrs. **Taylor.** Not to my knowledge.

Senator **Hart.** Here again it would upset the order of the school day, I know, and in too many of the neighborhoods where this very acute inadequacy of facilities exists, this is probably the very neighborhood where there isn't any community facility.

Mrs. **Taylor.** There may not be a community facility, but usually there is some building which is capable of being converted satisfactorily to such usage.

MUST BE FLEXIBILITY IN FUNDING

Senator **Hart.** I think it behooves us when we talk about getting additional funding to improve facilities, creating improved facilities, we ought to be very sure that there is flexibility sufficient to use some of that money to engage or to improve facilities in the neighborhood, if that is cheaper and the quicker way to respond, subject, however, to the local board's judgment as to the danger of crossing streets and so on. Every hour you listen, you are reminded again by the fact it is tough to be poor. I guess that is the message.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy. Just one quick question.

You are objecting to identifying poor children through their parents having to go through the application procedures. Outside of a guaranteed annual income that would provide people with the income necessary to pay for the lunches, something like that, which I think we all think is necessary, do you have any ideas what you want to be done to improve the application procedure itself if we must live with it for the time being?

Mrs. Taylor. I was speaking to the so-called depressed areas. I feel that in these areas lunch should be available to all children, there would be a small percentage of children who would be so affluent that they couldn't profit from this.

Mr. Cassidy. Wouldn't you think it might be possible with money saved in those areas of going through an application procedure might pay for the few lunches that are going to people who could pay for them?

Mrs. Taylor. Do I understand your question now?

Mr. Cassidy. What I was saying was, don't you think that in these areas that you are describing where there are large numbers of poor children, large majorities of poor children, if you were to serve everybody in those areas a free lunch and have no application procedure you might save as much money in administrative costs, in the cost of having to have people apply and having to judge the applications and everything else, as it might cost you to pay for the few extra lunches that the child might be just over the income guidelines for?

Mrs. Taylor. I would agree with that.

Mr. Cassidy. Thank you.

Senator Hart. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. Beckham. Mrs. Taylor, I have one question concerning the facilities and the success of the program. Would it be your opinion that given the facilities that we are now operating with in mostly inner city schools that we will have a tough time meeting a 100 percent feeding of the needy children with these kinds of facilities?

Mrs. Taylor. That we presently have?

Mrs. Beckham. Yes, that we presently have.

Mrs. Taylor. Yes; yes, it would. Even with the additional funds there would still be problems. But certainly it would be minimized, you know, with the additional aides and expanded facilities.

Mr. Beckham. Thank you.

Senator Hart. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. Kinney. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am happy to see you point out one of the areas that sometimes disqualifies an individual or causes him to disqualify himself here in the area of family data sheet. I wonder if you could supply our committee with one of those sheets at a later time if you don't have one now?

Mrs. Taylor. Yes; I brought one just for that purpose.

Mr. Kinney. If we could get one for the record, it would be of help.

Senator Hart. We will make it a part of the record* at this time.

(The document referred to follows:)

---

*See also Appendix 2, pp. 1503–1506.

FAMILY DATA SHEET

SCHOOL ______ DATE ______

Dear Parent: A request that ______ (child or children) be furnished ______ has been received by the school. Please fill out this blank completely and return it to the school. Your application will be carefully considered.

FAMILY NAME ______ FATHER ______ MOTHER ______ PHONE ______

ADDRESS ______ APT. NO. ______ FLOOR ______ FRONT ______ REAR ______

List the names of ALL CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY WHO ARE LIVING AT HOME.

NAME	AGE	WHERE EMPLOYED OR SCHOOL ATTENDING	TAKE HOME PAY OR GRADE
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

a. c. ctr. List all other people living in your home.

NAME	AGE	RELATIONSHIP	WHERE EMPLOYED	TAKE HOME PAY
1.				
2.				

Father's place of employment ______ Badge No. ______ Take home pay/week $ ______

Mother's place of employment ______ Badge No. ______ Take home pay/week $ ______

Does anyone pay room or board? ______ How much per week $ ______

Unemployment Compensation per week $ ______ Social Security per month $ ______

Monthly income from rentals $ ______ Income from other sources $ ______

Rent ( ) or Payment ( ) on home per month $ ______

Automobile: Year ______ Make ______ Payments per month $ ______

Aid from Welfare or A. D. C.
- Central Intake ( )
- 15th District ( )
- Non-Settlement ( )
- A. D. C. ( )

Case Number ______ Worker ______

LIST ALL OTHER DEBTS

FIRM OR COMPANY	MONTHLY PAYMENTS	BALANCE
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

Give any other information which you might think helpful ______

You may contact your school if you have any questions regarding this questionnaire. Please be assured that this information will be held strictly confidential.

Form 4536

______
Signature of Parent

Mr. **Kinney**. I think this would be a good point in time to introduce this particular data sheet from Vigo County School Corp., Terre Haute, Ind.

Senator **Hart**. It will be made a part of the record.

(The document referred to follows:)

VIGO COUNTY SCHOOL CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR FREE OR REDUCED PRICE LUNCH

Date ----------------------
Student ---------------------------- Age ---- Grade ---- School ------------
Address --
Date of birth ----------------, 19 ---- City ------------ State ------------
Father ---------------------------- Mother ----------------------------
Ages of other members of family --
Problem --

Family receiving assistance from ---------------------------------------
Amount of assistance -------- Week: -------- Month: -------- Year: --------
Other income:
  Father ------------------ yearly average.
  Mother ------------------ yearly average.
  Others ------------------ yearly average.
Family status:
  Parents living together ----
  Parents separated ----
  Parents divorced ----
  Family deserted by ------------
  Deceased parent (M), (F)
  Student living with relatives of -------------------
Home conditions:
  Type of house ----------------
  Exterior condition ----------------
  Interior condition ----------------
  Home is owned ----------------
  Rented @ ---------------- month
  Mortgaged ----------------
Investigation requested by ---
Recommendation:
  Free lunch ----
  Partial payment ----
  Request denied ----
  Amount student can pay ----
  Other ------------------------

Attendance officer.

Request approved ------------------------ Denied: --------------------
Form II-F1 1/23/68

Director of Food Services.

Mr. **Kinney**. It kind of points out the regular routine of things but it gets down to the basis of asking some very pointed questions that most people would hesitate to answer. For instance, it goes into a family's specific problems. It indicates an investigation will be conducted on the family, and anyone would hate to have an investigation by the sheer fact they are a little embarrassed by their family's conditions. For the record, we would appreciate your comments.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you very much.

The Regional Director of the Food Nutrition Services of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Dennis Doyle.

Mr. Doyle.

STATEMENT OF DENNIS M. DOYLE, MIDWEST REGIONAL DIRECTOR, FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. Doyle. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your invitation of this committee to testify at this hearing on the operation of the school lunch program in Michigan. I am aware that you have been talking with the Michigan Department of Public Instruction and other interested parties about the State of the national school lunch program in Michigan.

What I would like to do is give an overview review of what the Food and Nutrition Service is doing to provide food to children in both public and private schools in Michigan.

We recognize three general areas of interest and concern: where we are today in the program, where we want to be with the program in the months and years ahead, and what obstacles we must meet and overcome to operate the program more effectively in this State.

I am sure that in view of this committee's intimate knowledge of the child nutrition problems it isn't necessary for me to go into any detail on the mechanics of program operation. But, very briefly, the Michigan Department of Public Instruction administers the program in public schools in the State and it is generally responsible for expending Federal funds and must comply with all Federal regulations in such expenditures. It assumes the administrative responsibility for the program and all that that responsibility entails in terms of expanding and maintaining the food service program, of providing technical assistance to schools, and in providing leadership in planning training programs and encouraging and supporting schools without a lunch program to initiate them to have a program.

The Food and Nutrition Service is responsible for such things as establishing program guidelines, apportioning program funds to the State for public schools, establishing meal-type requirements, shipping donated commodities in this State to central points designated by the State where the State then assumes the responsibility for further distribution, and, of course, promoting and supporting outreach efforts by the State agency to expand the program.

Less Than Half Public Schools Participate

Regarding the public schools, according to the most recent figures I have available to me, there are 5,300 schools in the State of Michigan, and of these 2,521 are in the national school lunch program. Within the schools participating in the national school lunch program, the average daily attendance is 1,632,440, and the average daily participation in the national school lunch program is 598,518. In other words, 20 percent of the children participating in the program are receiving free or reduced-price lunches.

Due to legal complications, of which I am sure you are aware, the State of Michigan does not administer the school lunch program in nonpublic schools. Rather, the Food and Nutrition Service, the regional office of that service, administers the program in Michigan's nonpublic schools.

ONLY ONE-FIFTH PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN PROGRAM

According to present figures I have available there are 1,170 private schools in the State, of which 235 participate in the national school lunch program.

The average daily attendance in March of 1971 in participating schools was 69,961, and there was an average of 41,763 children parcicipating in the program each day. In other words, of this total 25 percent of them were served free or reduced-price lunches.

With the major thrust of the past year being expansion of the programs to additional private schools and children, we have cooperated in every way possible with private schools in Michigan in trying to find new approaches to accomplish the goals of the program.

As one small example, we recently held in Detroit, as a matter of fact it was last week, a meeting with the private school administrators who circularized all of the private schools in the Detroit area, asked them to attend the meeting at which we could explain the benefits of the program and hopefully induce them to enter their schools in the program, and frankly, Senator, our response was disappointing. I think as a result of the meeting, however, we will bring two additional private schools into the national school lunch program.

Senator **HART**. What type private school are you talking about, parochial?

Mr. **DOYLE**. We are talking about nonpublic schools, parochial schools, private schools, that are not public.

Senator **HART**. I understood that, but I mean when you met here in Detroit last week with whom were you meeting, not by name but by organization?

Mr. **DOYLE**. Principally with administrators of Catholic schools.

With respect to the implementation of the free or reduced-price lunch policy in the State, I can say unequivocally that we have from every private school with which we have an agreement a policy statement agreeing to the implementation of a free or reduced-price lunch policy. And we are continuing to work with the Michigan department of education to obtain adequate policy statements in full implementation of all public schools in the State.

Whenever, of course, we have any adverse comments on program operations, regardless of the source, we look into them and, where necessary, try to initiate corrective action.

There are still a large number of Michigan school children who do not have access to food service at school, and many of these, of course, are needy. Our objective is to reach the highest number possible with a food service. A paramount consideration is to see that every school child has the opportunity to receive a nutritious lunch while at school.

At present, according to our latest figures, approximately 225,000 children are eligible for free and reduced-price lunches.

I saw a reference in this morning's paper about 300,000. I am talking about asking the schools in the State that are participating in the program to report the number of children in the school who are in need of a free or reduced-price lunch, and the report we get approximates 225,000 in the State in both public and private schools. So that our figures show that about 62 percent of the potential eligibles for free lunches, or about 139,110 children, now receive free or reduced-price lunches in the schools. Of course we are wanting to make this 100 percent of those attending school.

In our work with the private schools——

Senator Hart. Mr. Doyle, could you tell us whether the statistics that the Midwest Region operates require the reporting of the percentage of school children who would be eligible for reduced or free lunches? Do the schools report the number, or the statistic as to the number, of children eligible for your reduced price to the total number of eligible children, or just the total number of children in the schools which, in fact, operate a school lunch program?

Mr. Doyle. What we get now, Senator, is a report from participating schools twice a year on the number of children who are eligible for a free lunch, and then, of course, what we are getting on a monthly basis in terms of program operation are the total number of lunches served and the total number served free.

Senator Hart. So that when we say that 62 percent of the potential eligibles for free lunches now receive free or reduced prices, that means that 62 percent of those who are eligible in the total of the participating schools?

Mr. Doyle. That is correct.

Senator Hart. If we included the total of children eligible for free or reduced lunches in a school system, we would discover a lower percentage, wouldn't we?

Mr. Doyle. That's right; that is exactly right.

ONLY THREE STATES REACH LESS

Senator Hart. I have cititicized the Michigan performance for failing to reach more than 35 percent of the needy children. My impression is that when I say the total of needy children in Michigan, I am talking about the children in all the schools, not just to those that participate. And when we compare Michigan, as we have, to the rest of the country and find that only three other States have a lower percentage of participation, are we making a comparison on the same basis?

Mr. Doyle. Yes, I think we are. I don't know what figures you have available to you, Senator.

Senator Hart. I am told the answer is yes.

Mr. Cassidy. Across the country they are all reporting. The Department of Agriculture has requested, has directed the States, the schools participating in the program to report their number of eligibles and then that becomes the total number of eligibles from which the Department does all their basic work or eligibles and percentage of children reached.

Senator Hart. Well, then, the 62 percent participation by Michigan still leaves it four from the end?

Mr. Doyle. I have some figures here before me with respect to——

Senator Hart. I want that question answered somehow before we get out of town.

Mr. Doyle. Whether or not they are fourth from the end, what I have with me, Senator, and all that was indicated I would need, were some figures with respect to the 11 States here in the Midwest. I have no national figures with me. However, I would be glad to do what I can to get them for you.

Anyway, on the basis of the figures I have, if you would like to have these, your ranking might be exactly right. As a matter of fact, it is the lowest of 11 States here in the Midwest. They rank as the lowest of the 11 States in the Midwest.

Michigan Lowest of 11 Midwest States

Senator Hart. Michigan's percentage of participation by children who are entitled to free or reduced lunch is the lowest of the 11 Midwestern States?

Mr. Doyle. That is deriving the figures from the source that we talked of.

Senator Hart. Namely, the report to you by the participating schools?

Mr. Doyle. That is right.

Senator Hart. And you tell us that we have 62 percent of the potential eligibles who were free?

Mr. Doyle. That is right.

Senator Hart. And the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service out of Washington shows that Michigan's participation percent of eligibles reached is 32 percent. I can see why the report from the last at 32 percent——

Mr. Doyle. What I am doing, Senator, if I may, I am citing figures for March of 1971.

Senator Hart. That is what——

Mr. Doyle. And those figures——

Senator Hart. The Washington office tabulates.

Mr. Doyle. I think they are low.

Senator Hart. I think it is important enough and basic enough to attempt right now to resolve, if we can, this business of where we stand.

Which Formula Is Being Used?

Yesterday Mr. Boroughs was asked what occurred that would have dramatically increased the percentage of participation in Michigan from January to March, a very dramatic step up, from 32 percent to 62 percent. He said, well, that prior to January, prior to early this year, we had been reporting the percentage of participation against the total number of children eligible, whether they were in or out of the participating schools. But early this year, apparently at either the direction of the Department or in recognition of the practice of the Department to accept the other formula, he reported the percentage of participation of needy children against the total of the children in participating Michigan schools, and he jumped from 30 to 60 percent. Do the other States in the Midwest region, or did they at the time of your March 1971 computation which shows Michigan the lowest, use the new Michigan formula or the old Michigan formula? Did they report the percentage of the entire population of needy school children or just the participating schools?

Mr. **Doyle.** They reported the percentage of the schools participating in the national school lunch program.

Senator **Hart.** Let me stew over these two things, having in mind the difficulty we are having. I am not relating like a Michigan nationalist to say it is impossible that we are that bad, it is altogether possible, but I want to be sure. You are not responsible for the national document that I hold in my hand, but that shows Michigan at 32.5 percent participation, and yet it shows Wisconsin with 104 percent participation. I can't buy the notion we are making a comparison on the same basis. I mean I hope we discover that we are not.

Mr. **Doyle.** The only information I have is that we are getting comparable figures from the States in the Midwest and that they are based on the way I have explained it here. I don't know about that 104-percent figure. It is conceivable, of course, that more free lunches are being given than needy children are being reported. That is the only way you can explain a figure like 104 percent. What is 104 percent of 100?

Senator **Hart.** It has been pointed out to me on the document there is a footnote following that Wisconsin figure of 104 percent. The footnote reads, "State feels reported figure is correct." It didn't go unnoticed. And you are not responsible for this.

Mr. **Doyle.** I didn't prepare this.

Senator **Hart.** I think we interrupted you. You were at the top of page 5.

Mr. **Doyle.** Talking again about the private schools. In our work with the private schools we find that many, and particularly church-related schools, face an uncertain future. They are reluctant to think of adding a food service when they are not sure that they will still be in operation 2 or 3 years from now. This is especially true if they now lack space and food service facilities, even if the school serves low-income children and thus could get Federal assistance to finance part of the cost of needed equipment. I am talking about one of the problems of getting child feeding programs into private schools.

I think that overriding these considerations, too, is the problem of apathy. In some instances school administrators fail to realize the serious nutritional problems faced by needy children. School administrators answer to the people they serve. However, if the community is apathetic towards the child nutrition program, then administrators find it hard to sell the idea even when they themselves recognize the need for the program.

I would say in conclusion, Senator Hart, that, despite some of the figures we have seen, a relatively good job is being done, and, I think, the recent figures you just cited there would evidence this fact. I think a great many people in the State of Michigan are working toward the end of feeding all the school children in the State and I think with the continued support of the Congress and the aggressive leadership on all levels of administration that the obstacles I mentioned here can be surmounted to the ultimate good of the people most affected by the program and that is our children.

I am certain you have some more questions and I will endeavor to answer them.

Thank you very much.

Senator **Hart.** Thank you, Mr. Doyle.

I made a statement in the morning session which may or may not have been correct and I think you can correct it if I was wrong. Some criticism was voiced that certain children simply do not like white milk, that nonetheless white milk continues to be delivered as part of the lunch and it is wasted. Why not use a chocolate milk? I was advised, and stated on the record, there was no requirement that would prohibit chocolate milk.

CHOCOLATE-FLAVORED MILK O.K.

Mr. **Doyle.** You are correct. The requirement with respect to milk is that fresh fluid whole milk meeting the butterfat standards of the State must be used and, of course, you can add chocolate to the milk and make chocolate milk out of it. This is a precaution against a flavored drink, Senator.

Senator **Hart.** Let's assume, without pursuing this business of the figures, that we indeed are fourth from the last among the 50 States in the country of the number of needy children we reach. I am not asking you to make a judgment, a comparison between ourselves and Florida and Maine, but you had an opportunity to observe the performance of this school lunch program in the 11 States which are our neighbors. Again assuming that we are the last among those 11, why?

Mr. **Doyle.** Why are we the last among the 11? That is a $64 question, of course. I don't know how it is possible to answer that. There are so many things that go into it, so many things were talked about here today as I listened, the apathy of some school administrators or the just disinterest, the facilities, and so forth and so on. I do think this, Senator, that there is a pronounced improvement, particularly in the area of serving free lunches, in the State of Michigan, and I believe these figures are accurate. I think that certainly there is an interest on the part of the Department of Agriculture, on the part of the Department of Public Instruction. I think with the advent of State administrated expense funds here in the past few years they have been able to add some people to their staff and as a consequence they have been able to do some outreach. I think there is a lot of education that needs to get into the program in Michigan. I think efforts are being made to that end. But just to be able to pinpoint what is the essential difference as between this State and another State, I don't know.

Senator **Hart.** Does any one single action occur to you that was taken in any of our neighboring States which produced a very significant increase in the participation in that State?

NEARLY 50-PERCENT RISE DUE TO STATE LEGISLATION

Mr. **Doyle.** Yes. In Illinois, for example, Senator, a more recent school lunch legislation was passed which provided $6 million of State money to pay for free lunches exclusively. That is the purpose of the money. There has been a tremendous increase in free lunches in the State of Illinois, As an example, in the city of Chicago before this money was available they were serving about 90,000 free lunches per day and this figure jumped to—I am afraid to cite figures like this because it is off the top of my head—I know it was at least 130,000 and I understand it is higher than that. So that is a phenomenal increase, with the additional money that the Congress has made available for free lunches plus the State money.

Senator **Hart**. There was an increase of 130,000?

Mr. **Doyle**. Yes; yes.

Senator **Hart**. Over what, 250,000 or 300,000, something like that?

Mr. **Doyle**. No; there were about, and I don't have the latest figure, Senator, please understand that, but let me cite a figure that I know of, and this goes back several months. They were, before they had this State money available, serving 90,000 free lunches a day in total in the city of Chicago, and the latest figure I saw had risen to 130,000, but I understand it is considerably more than that at the present time.

Senator **Hart**. I won't push you any more and get you into further trouble, either with us or our neighbor. All of us do want to understand what it is that will improve our position.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. **Cassidy**. No questions, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. **Beckham**. Mr. Borough yesterday estimated there are about 197,000 needy children in buildings where food service is currently available in Michigan. We are reaching about 130,000 or 61 percent of the needy. The document we were talking about earlier from Washington talked about 224,000 as the number of eligible needy children, let's see, 72,700, a percent of 32.5. Somewhere the bookkeeping is absolutely broken down.

Mr. **Doyle**. I think that figure is wrong.

Mr. **Beckham**. Which figure?

Mr. **Doyle**. The 32 percent figure.

Senator **Hart**. Let me identify it for the record and insert the document* we talked about.

It is captioned "Estimates of needy children in National School Lunch Program schools eligible for, and reached with, free or reduced-price lunches, March 1971", from the Food Nutrition Service of the USDA, the United States Department of Agriculture.

100 PERCENT—STILL MISSING 100,000 NEEDY

Mr. **Beckham**. My next question would be that Illinois listed 265,000 estimated needy in buildings where there are food services, they are reaching 261,000 of those, 98.5 percent. Those of us who know just a little bit about Illinois asume it is fair to say that if there are 265,000 needy in the schools with facilities, there is a good number, say 100,000 outside of these same schools, which means that regardless of what the statistics show here and the ratings and the figures, we are missing several hundred thousand needy children statistically and foodwise. Even if Illinois showed 100 percent under this measurement here, there would be a hundred thousand, probably, or better, children still not receiving food. With Michigan, which reports 224,000 estimated needy, Mr. Borough himself conservatively guessed 300,000 needy children in the school system in the State of Michigan. So even if we hit 100 percent based on this formula, we are still missing almost 100,000 needy children.

---

*See Appendix 2, p. 1506.

Mr. **Doyle.** I have no idea what the figure would be but I am sure we would be missing some.

Mr. **Beckham.** Just from Michigan, exactly 88,000, and that is conservative. My only point is that this is the kind of numbers game and the kind of bookkeeping operation that will definitely slow the progress, creativity, drive, and determination to eliminate the kind of thing we are after, which is hunger. There is no way an agency which claims to be in the business of trying to feed hungry children can devise an accounting system that, in fact, eliminates a third of the people they are trying to help. It is awfully tough to understand that.

This is the reason we had the demonstration this morning. Nothing disturbed me more than to have to see it happen here. We have to answer it, too. So far we have not received an answer.

You say you didn't compare the figures, but, by golly, I think the record of this hearing ought to stay open long enough to make sure that in a very short time, not just Michigan's figures but probably every State is listed. The true figures on the number of hungry children should be, in fact, reported, recorded, and then should begin the effort to appropriate the money and everything else to see that we get at the problem. Short of that, I don't see how we can necessarily listen to any more answers. I don't think there is any further need; we are talking a shell game from here on.

Mr. **Doyle.** Of course it isn't the purpose of the accounting system to do what you indicated. The purpose of the accounting system, hopefully, is the best accounting system that we have. Guessing how many needy children are in the State is sort of a perilous undertaking, and we would hope that if these are actually needy children in the schools that are participating that we could reach a hundred percent of them, at least you would have that much of the problem solved. We have gone to every known source for figures on needy children and we have gone to Title 1, USDA which are old figures and not too many people put any credence in them. We have gone to the welfare office, and when you go to welfare and talk of people on public welfare and children in schools and how many there are, you can get these figures but at the same time you are missing the people on low income families who are not on welfare, who are not accountable any other way. One of the advantages of the application system that I heard criticized this morning is that it provides a form of equity. If you feel you need a free lunch, you can make an application and a determination can be made that you need a free lunch and can be given. But until we do, I agree 100 percent, what we ought to do is to have figures that indicate how many children there are. Maybe, hopefully, we can get better figures out of this census when they are published. We are all trying to meet the entire need. It isn't a case of trying to juggle figures so some child won't get a free lunch.

JUGGLING RAISES PERCENTAGE FROM 32 TO 62

Mr. BECKHAM. That is the end result. Michigan is the perfect example, the figures were juggled. It was to the administrator's benefit to change his computation system to that which better patterned USDA's. It was to his benefit to get that 32 percent to 62 percent to show on the record, because whatever his inducements, incentives, or motives in Washington or Chicago were, he felt compelled to do it. That is my only point, at the point at which the director of the program feels compelled to do it, you know what that means all the way down the line of the program. So I understand your position.

Senator HART. Let me explain where I got caught in some considerable embarrassment on that. Each year in the last series of years a number of us in the Senate have gone in and tried to get increased funding, and we cited the progress we were making, complaining, of course, that it was unsatisfactory until we had gotten to 100 percent of all the children who were needy, and we were working even through much of this year on a bookkeeping system, a set of figures, that showed we had now narrowed it to where there were only a million yet to be reached. You know, when you cut it that close, some of the zip goes out of the argument we ought to increase the funding. Then we discovered, as we are trying to unravel here, that we were one whale of a way away from reaching the last million of the hungry children just because of this kind of bookkeeping. And it does have a very practical effect on the ability of those who are concerned to get the money otherwise, if you think you are just talking contrasted to 10 years ago a handful, than if you can go in and say, you know, this many million of children.

HOW MANY HUNGRY CHILDREN IN ALL SCHOOLS?

That is another reason why it is important, I guess that is the most important reason, to get our accountants to sit down and unravel it and the figure that we ought to have in hand, as you have indicated you agree with me, what we have to know as a society, how many of our children are hungry. Not how many children who live on the west side of Woodward Avenue are hungry, but how many children are hungry. Not how many children are yet to be reached in schools that are needy, but how many children are in school. Not to belabor it, but that is the reason for our reaction.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. CASSIDY. No further questions.

Senator HART. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. KINNEY. Mr. Doyle, you mentioned that 235 private schools participate in the school lunch program. How much does that cost the Federal Government in Federal money?

Mr. DOYLE. I don't have any cost figures here right now.

Mr. KINNEY. Could you supply them later?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, I could. With respect to how much it costs, what we are reimbursing with in terms of the child nutrition?

Mr. KINNEY. How many Federal dollars do these private schools receive?

Mr. DOYLE. I would be very happy to supply* that.

---

*See Appendix 2, p. 1507.

Mr. Kinney. You might not be the person, I can't remember whether we had any previous testimony to this effect or not. Are we experiencing the same kind of disciplinary problems in the private schools relative to the lunch programs as have been indicated we have been experiencing in public schools?

Mr. Doyle. Not to the degree, certainly.

Mr. Kinney. Why?

Mr. Doyle. Simply because there are more public schools and more children. I presume this would have some bearing on it. I really don't know.

Mr. Kinney. Do the private schools have more supervision, more personnel for supervision, or better staff?

Mr. Doyle. No, I don't think they have better staffs or more people for supervision. Actually, there is a lack of teachers and so forth in the private schools, is why so many of them have a lack of money.

Mr. Kinney. So due to the number of children in the private school——

Mr. Doyle. I really don't know. I said naturally numbers would have some bearing on any degree of disciplinary problems. And actually I am not certain what the difference is so far as disciplining is concerned as between public and private schools.

Private Schools Have Submitted Plans

Mr. Kinney. OK. You also mention here that our private schools have submitted some form of approved policy statement.

Mr. Doyle. Yes. This is required under the regulations, new legislation, part of the mandatory provision for the service of a free or reduced price lunch to a needy child. The school offers a plan for providing such lunches, and every private school in the State of Michigan has submitted such a plan to my office.

Mr. Kinney. I wonder if we could have a cross section, a cross-representative view of the particular plans to get some idea what that policy statement is?

Mr. Doyle. I think they are fairly standard in terms of agreeing to serve a free lunch to children from families with a given income, they're standard here in the State. We are using the guidelines established by the Secretary of Agriculture. It is simply an agreement that they will abide by the regulations and abide by these income standards in providing free lunches. And, of course, this is a provision that has national applicability.

Mr. Kinney. How many students are we talking about in 235 schools? I can't tell about the number. That is on page 3.

Mr. Doyle. It covers daily attendance in March 1971, 69,961, and 41,763 participated daily in the national school lunch program, in other words, and 25 percent of the total who participated were served free or reduced price lunches.

Mr. Kinney. This is in the private schools?

Mr. Doyle. Yes, sir.

Mr. Kinney. Thank you very much.

Senator Hart. Mr. Doyle, thank you very much.

Mr. Doyle. Thank you, Senator.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator Hart. Mr. John Ruggles, president of the Community Action Administrators Association.

Mr. Ruggles. I am John Ruggles.

Senator Hart. For the record will you identify those you are associated with?

Mr. Revis. Ed Revis, executive director, O.C.C.E.O.

Mr. Grier. Cris Grier, chairman of State Coordinating Committee on Emergency Food and Medical Services for Michigan.

Mr. Goldberg. David Goldberg, consultant to Control Systems Research to the national office, Office of Economic Opportunity for Emergency Food and Medical Services.

Mr. Call. I am Jack Call from the State Economic Opportunity Office.

STATEMENT OF JOHN RUGGLES, CHAIRMAN, MICHIGAN COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION, BARRYTON, MICH., ACCOMPANIED BY J. CRIS GRIER, CHAIRMAN, FIVE-CAP, INC., DAVID A. GOLDBERG, CONSULTANT TO CONTROL SYSTEMS RESEARCH, INC., EDWARD P. REVIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, O.C.C.E.O., AND JACK CALL, MICHIGAN ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY OFFICE

Mr. Ruggles. I have a prepared statement. I will give this statement to you.

I apologize for the statement being somewhat incorrect in typing but the young lady that typed it this morning informed me she did not have an adequate breakfast.

Americans today are seriously probing into the general quality of life in this country and whether we agree or disagree on the variety of problems and issues. There cannot be any disagreement that millions of children are going hungry each day and that this is a result of inadequate leadership and indifference at the national level of our Government. The community action agencies in Michigan see this lack of initiative and commitment as an illegal and immoral attack on the birthright of the children of this State. To allow this to continue is to doom another generation of poor children to the cycle of poverty. Americans think of themselves as being deeply devoted to the well-being of their children and yet we are denying the fullest intellectual and physical development of poverty stricken children in this land because of badly constructed and misunderstood programs that are designed to eliminate hunger. Therefore, our association has appointed a statewide committee to seek solutions to the barriers in the national school lunch program and present our report to you.

It is my pleasure to introduce Mr. Cris Grier who is the chairman of this committee and who will now deliver the association report.

Mr. Grier. Senator Hart, Gentlemen.

Feeding hungry children is our number one priority.

The amendments to the National School Lunch Act (P.L. 91-48) signed by the President on May 14, 1970, makes a free or reduced price lunch available to every low-income child in the country.

President Nixon pledged that all low-income children in the Nation would have a free or reduced price lunch by Thanksgiving 1970. Federal money is available to help school districts set up and operate school lunch programs in all schools. In November of 1970 there were 295,000 children eligible for a free or reduced price lunch in the State of Michigan. There are probably more eligible children by now because of the high unemployment. But only 88,000 children were being fed such a school lunch. This means that there were 207,000 eligible children waiting for a lunch program. There were still 1,500 schools that did not have any lunch program.

Department of Agriculture officials and State school lunch directors share a common commitment to carry out the objectives set forth in the new school lunch regulations which went into effect January 1, 1971. Both of the above encounter one major difficulty. At the State level, there is not sufficient staff to visit every school district and encourage full participation in the program.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS MADE EVASION POSSIBLE

In spite of the Congressional/Presidential mandate to see that the needy children are fed, some local school districts are still reluctant to expand or initiate lunch programs. Federal regulations leave room for local school districts to reinterpret laws and evade their responsibilities for feeding poor and needy children.

A statement taken from the Clearinghouse Review, January 1971 is as follows:

> In almost every state in the country, and particularly in the Northeast and Midwest, there are still many schools without a school lunch program. The failure to implement programs, particularly in impoverished areas, is mainly attributable to the limited enlightenment and misplaced priorities of educators. In most cases they have either failed to comprehend the relationship between adequate nutrition and the ability to learn, or they have decided that poor children's nutritional concerns should take a back seat to political priorities established by the richer community. However, there are other reasons which are frequently asserted by school administrators, the most common being the absence of cafeteria and kitchen facilities.
>
> While it is true that many schools do not presently have equipment or facilities to prepare mid-day meals, it does not necessarily follow that those schools are unable to operate a lunch program. Quite the contrary. A school district which does not have kitchen facilities in all of its schools can still operate a lunch program through one or a combination of several methods. It can:
>
> (1) set up a satelite feeding system;
> (2) establish a central kitchen program;
> (3) provide meals through a catering service; or
> (4) distribute cold lunches.
>
> Each method of program implementation differs in desirability, but all of them at least make nutritious foods available.
>
> If a school district prefers to purchase facilities and equipment, so that every school has a self-contained school lunch operation, then substantial amounts of federal money will be made available to help subsidize such purchases. The most important federal source of funding for this purpose are ss 5 of the School Lunch Act and ss 5 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; the special school lunch program authorizations from ss 32 of the 1935 Agricultural Act; and Title 1 of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (called E.S.E.A.). In addition, state funds may also be available to purchase equipment for the implementation of the School Lunch programs. In short, for school districts that are determined to feed needy children, there are ample methods and resources available to assure mid-day meals for everyone.

If political and community organizing efforts fail to force the districts to establish school lunch programs in every school, then litigation efforts must ensue.

Many school boards refuse to become financially liable in appropriating local school funds for feeding programs. These school boards feel more Federal funds should be allocated for lunchroom construction and also for the operation of a lunch program.

STIGMATIZED TREATMENT PREVENTS NEEDY PARTICIPATION

Poor children frequently choose not to participate in the free lunch program because of discriminatory and dehumanizing treatment against recipients. Parents often feel that their children will be slighted in school activities if they are getting a free lunch. Additionally, they fear either a moral judgment on the part of the teacher concerning a child's right to participate or a superior attitude on the part of other students who discover which children are getting free lunches. Although the teacher cannot directly prevent the child from receiving a free lunch, she can dramatize to his peer group a stigmatism of poverty. An extreme example of this may be witnessed in one northern Michigan school district, where a teacher writes the names of the children getting a free or reduced price lunch on the front blackboard so as to facilitate the weekly distribution of lunch tickets.

The State Coordinating Committee on Emergency Food and Medical Service finds that approximately 40 percent of the children eligible for a free or reduced price lunch are not being fed. This figure is around 300,000 children. A direct cause of this 40 percent nonparticipation is rooted in local interpretation of the laws. In some school districts, if a student lives within a mile of the school he must go home for lunch. There are a considerable number of poor and needy children that are forced to go home for lunch. Most of the poor never receive lunch at home; perhaps because they are aware of the lack of food at home for lunch; perhaps because the home lunch period is diverted to a home play period; perhaps because the parents can't force the child to eat food that does not exist.

In Kalamazoo, Dr. John Cochran, Kalamazoo School Superintendent, explained at a school board meeting in October 1970 that Kalamazoo's schools were built with the theory that children attending them could walk home for lunch. Because of this, no lunchroom facilities were built. Therefore, about 3,000 Kalamazoo children who are eligible for a free or reduced price lunch cannot receive them because of the lack of lunchroom facilities.

ACCOUNT NOT TAKEN OF 10-YEAR INFLATION

In Detroit, school authorities "determine" that a child whose father earns $47 a week for a family of four is able to pay. That's what Detroit's superintendent of schools testified in a lawsuit. He also stated that his school board's interpretation excluded every public-assistance-household child in Detroit from a free school lunch and every child on AFDC (Aid to Families of Dependent Children).

This $47-a-week rule was set back in 1960. Although the dollar is worth some 20 cents less today than it was then, no one has troubled to change the $47 exclusion level.

In Rural Grant, Mich., in January 1971, there were approximately 161 children eligible for a free or reduced price lunch: 39 received lunch at a reduced price, while only four received lunches free. This means there were 122 poor not being served. We find this school district's policy statement only refers to lunches at a reduced rate and fails to mention lunches "Free." There are other school districts that likewise fail to mention free lunches in their policy statement and only refer to lunches at a reduced rate.

Battle Creek, Mich., Calhoun County, the 12th largest county in the State, is only serving 10 percent of their needy children lunch at a free or reduced rate.

The State Coordinating Committee on Emergency Food and Medical Service wishes to acknowledge the indepth farsight that Senator Philip A. Hart had as early as 1964 to introduce to the Congress one of the earliest bills on the school lunch program. Community Action agencies were aware of his endorsement when they found cooperative efforts within their respective areas to implement the school lunch program of January 1971.

We have evidence of some 10 or more school districts not providing any free school lunches to their children. We show some comparative figures for January 1971 and March 1971.

In two of the school districts no free lunches were served because the reduced price lunch was only 5 cents and in two other school districts they decided the reduced price lunches were far below the 20-cent level so they at this point were providing no free lunches. In one school district they told the State they received no applications for free or reduced price lunches. The local Community Action Agency is checking this situation out.

Flint, Mich., will expand their lunch program operation to 41 schools and by September they will be serving in all school buildings. This should show a marked increase in reduced and also the free lunches.

On the four school districts of McBain Rural, Whitmore Lake, Stephenson, Mendon, we have little or no information on their programs, we are in the process of having the local Community Action program check the local procedures being followed.

40 PERCENT NOT BEING REACHED

Forty percent of the 300,000 Michigan students who qualifiy for a free or reduced price lunch are not being reached. The goal of the Community Action program and the Emergency Food and Medical Service program is to cut this number by one-half to only 20 percent not being fed by September 1971. The January 1972 goal is to further reduce the number of children not being reached to 10 percent of those who qualified. We are aware that there are some children who, for reasons of their own, do not want a free lunch. But by utilizing the Community Action program, Emergency Food and Medical Service outreach workers, we will be able to zero in on this total group of 40 percent not now being fed.

After discussion with regional staff, USDA staff, and the State School Lunch Director, it was determined that OEO region V and local Community Action programs could provide valuable assistance in helping school districts implement new feeding programs and expand existing programs.

The following is an outline of the procedure followed by the State Coordinating Committee on Emergency Food and Medical Service to accomplish these objectives: Existing resources of USDA and Child Nutrition Division, enlisting the aid of VISTA, Legal Service, Emergency Food, Control Systems Research, Inc., of Arlington, Va., the regional OEO, the State Resources such as the State School Lunch Directors, State Economic Opportunity Offices, additional possible State resources, the State labor federations and other statewide civic organizations, statewide church organizations and Welfare Rights Organizations, the local resources, the Local Education agencies, Community Action agencies. Outreach to assure that parents understand and that all eligible children are receiving a free or reduced price lunch. Emergency Food and Medical Service staff to assist local school districts on a short-range basis with the possibility of utilizing small amounts of Emergency Food and Medical Services moneys.

Emergency Food and Medical Services Outreach staff informed their policy groups and local area residents to encourage response to State legislature aiding the school lunch program, such as House bills Nos. 4106, 4103 and 4636, requesting State funds for a free or reduced price lunch for all needy children.

Our plan for action is to arrange meetings with the State School Lunch Director, requesting our local SEOO to make necessary arrangements; to develop lines of communications between Community Action agencies, local school officials, Parents' Advisory Councils, low-income groups and others to gather a program and pinpoint the area of concentrated need.

The progress to date is an overview of the Emergency Food and Medical Services programs, the role and functions of Control Systems Research as it relates to the program and the need for input regarding training by trainees.

Some of the immediate training needs are training for Outreach Workers, managerial training relative to guidelines, administration, and implementation of the new emphasis, and the first major need is the input on the school lunch program.

Recommendations

The State Coordinating Committee of the staff therefore makes the following recommendations:

(1) We recommend that no Federal funds be made available to school districts that do not have school lunch programs.

(2) We recommend that the Federal School Lunch Law require free lunches be provided to every child of a family where annual income is below the USDA subsistence level guidelines; currently the USDA guidelines for eligibility of children to receive free or reduced price lunches are well over $1,000 below that subsistence level.

(3) We recommend that every school district having a significant

poverty population and wishing to institute a lunch and/or breakfast program receive Federal funds for building construction and facilities.

(4) We recommend that Community Action agencies be designated and funded as a vehicle for certifying eligibility of children to receive free lunches throughout Michigan.

And on a graph by the American Committee showing the counties with serious hunger problems, there are 17 counties in the State of Michigan, 15 of these counties are located in the northern rural half of the State. This only aids to dramatize we do need the free and reduced price lunches throughout the State of Michigan.

Senator HART. I wish to thank all of those who assisted in the preparation of this brochure: Regional OEO, State OEO, Control Systems Research, CAP Directors Association and VISTA. Thank you very much, sir.

Senator HART. Did Mr. Goldberg conduct this training program that you mentioned?

Mr. GOLDBERG. Yes, sir, there were two sessions, one was in Mount Pleasant, Mich., and the other took place in East Lansing. In fact, the one in East Lansing was within the past 2 weeks.

Senator, since I am here on the people's money, I would like to make one statement in addition to this——

Senator HART. The reason I inquired, I would like to get some understanding of the training. If there is something else you wish to add, we might well have that, too.

Mr. GOLDBERG. The situation has been that I covered most of the six States in the OEO region V.

Senator HART. Name the States for the record.

Mr. GOLDBERG. That would be Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Illinois, Indiana.

The application that you have in evidence from Vigo County, Ind., was one that I picked up in the school department yesterday. I probably could have gone somewhere in Michigan had I been in a location in Michigan yesterday and produced an application for you that would have been very much the same.

Part of the problem of this I feel reflects two major things. One is paternalism, the second is a general effort on the part of the many local school districts to discourage participation in this school program. And this is in evidence throughout the country. The concern seems to be not with human beings but rather with something else.

You have seen from the statistics as quoted by Mr. Doyle and yesterday by Mr. Boroughs, that there are no statistics for children, there are statistics for lunches served, but there are no children involved. You cannot get figures for the number of children, you can only get figures for the number of lunches. You have to do some math to come across with the other.

The State plans of operations that were mentioned sound very interesting, there are a few problems there. Let me just mention one thing in connection with this application. The USDA now, knowing that this application has been used will, I assume, under their manadte, go out and do something about it, but their alternative of doing something about it is saying if you don't change this application we will withdraw your funds. The USDA and the State School Lunch Director's offices in Michigan or any other State do not have the kind of staff that can keep a constant patrol going in every school district in the United States and find out what they are actually doing. If they come across an instance of violation of the law, something can be done, but they cannot be on constant watch for this kind of thing.

No Funds for Enforcement

This is part of the problem, funds are simply lacking to provide the kind of enforcement that is necessary. Volunteer agencies such as the Community Action Program funded through other Federal funds can't do this, but the emergency food and medical program is at this point being phased out, there are no new budgets for them on emergency food and medical and where do they go from there in connection with this?

The State plans of operation outline how each school district within the State and school districts must file these by a certain date, will have every school in the district on a free lunch program or a national school lunch program. But this has no teeth in it, there is no deadline, they could have this done in the [illegible]r two thousand something. There is no force on this. Everything is left to local option of the individual school district's governing board. The people having the least club with that individual governing board are the poor people who can benefit most from this program and they have no real input into it, they are the ones who lose most from it. There have been local cases of litigation, Boston, Detroit, other places, where school districts having one school or two schools feeding hungry children under the national school lunch program are offering free lunches, where the case has been won by the plaintiff saying that all schools within the district therefore must have this under the 14th amendment, geographical location of a person not being a discriminatory factor.

School District Has Option To Withdraw

The other is in the national school lunch program, the law strictly states that priority is given to the neediest first. So the neediest innercity school districts, Title I school districts and so on, were the ones this was aimed at. The problem is that the school lunch program is like a sensitive plant, you touch it and it simply curls up and dries away. Right now if you win in a litigation like this with an individual school district, the individual school district has always the option at the end to simply say we will withdraw from the national school lunch program, simply give no lunches to anyone.

The problem I think we have to look at is school lunches for needy children, for all children is a priority, or is it not? If it is a priority, then does the 14th amendment apply only to local school districts or the entire State or the entire country?

Thank you.

Senator **Hart**. Mr. Grier, you have told us the program objectives that the Emergency Food and Medical Services Coordinating Committee has set for itself, you do this on page No. 7, 40 percent of the 300,000 Michigan children who qualify now are not being reached. The goal of the emergency food and medical services to cut that number by half, so that you fail to reach only 20 percent by September of 1971. Now, that is very close at hand, isn't it?

Mr. **Grier**. Yes, sir.

Senator **Hart**. How optimistic are you?

Mr. **Grier**. At this point, Senator, now that as of July 1, Congress, as you know, has eliminated the funds in the program of emergency food and medical services, and that the program no longer exists, now, for some community action agencies as of July 1 they would be losing "X" number of outreach people that have been in the field to do this. Our point now is to try to get the emergency food and medical services program refunded, or since USDA has, by act of Congress, and in the official congressional records, been stated as the one to do this job and they have put in their food nutritional service program and outline a point of "Outreach", another point of "to inform the low-income people of the need for services of the USDA." We feel at this point the expertise of the community action program and the medical food and service program outreach workers should come into play and do this very viable thing for USDA. We are asking that the U.S. Department of Agriculture count the community action programs and be funded for this. We have sent a letter to Mr. Springfield in Washington, D.C., for this very thing. I haven't heard his answer yet but I am awaiting a reply from him to see exactly how it is written or how it is interpreted, I know how it is written, but I want to know how it is interpreted.

Senator **Hart**. If possible, if one is available, would you let us have a copy of the letter that you mention? Not now, take your time.

Mr. **Grier**. I can give you one.

Senator **Hart**. We will make it part of the record.*

Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Kinney?

Mr. **Cassidy**. No questions.

Mr. **Kinney**. No questions.

Senator **Hart**. Is there anything that you would want to add since you have three members here?

Mr. **Revis**. I would like to kind of cite one of the examples in terms of experience that the CAP has had over the years, and that experience is in the operations, operational direction that relates to Title I, the elementary and secondary act.

Congress, when they went together this past year, what they did was eliminate the check-point procedure which said Community Action Agencies should be very much involved in dealing with the education or academic improvement of disadvantaged kids in local communities of a school district. Now, we lost that across the country, and what it did was really undermine the effect that Community Action Programs had in terms of identifying school districts that weren't really focusing on the disadvantaged children for academic achievement. What I am asking here is that I would like to see, I am speaking for my colleagues, the Community Action Agencies across the State of Michigan, that something like this that we would have some kind of a club in dealing with school districts to truly identify those needy kids within that school system and that they must supply the school breakfast or the school lunch for those kids and have it be a check-off because we feel that like the educational program, the Title I, we lost the club, and only because of the emphasis by the State Board of Education we are still involved, but not as strongly.

---

*See Appendix 2, p. 1508.

DOVETAILED RESPONSIBILITY WOULD ASSIST DISTRICTS BETTER

If we were able to dovetail the same kind of responsibility into the Community Action Agencies throughout the State of Michigan then we would be able to better assist the school districts to identify those kids and to make certain that these youths were getting the kind of program that they were entitled to.

Mr. CALL. Senator, if I may, I would like to amplify on one point in the statement of the Emergency Food and Medical Services Directors' Coordinating Committee. In their recommendation they make a point, let's see what page it is, on page 12, No. 2, "We recommend that the Federal School Lunch Law require free lunches be provided to every child of a family where annual income is below the USDA subsistence level guidelines," saying further that "currently the USDA guide lines for eligibility of children to receive free or reduced price lunches are well over $1,000 below that subsistence level." I think we were correct in making the statement that way in referring to USDA guide lines, if that is the proper word, it is the amount of dollars a family needs currently for subsistence living. I recall a figure of something like fifty-two hundred, fifty-four hundred dollars to maintain the minimums in shelter, in clothing and food. As you are aware, as all of us are aware, the Act required as of January 1971 the figure for a family of four to qualify for a free lunch was something like $4,025 or somewhere immediately like that. It is clearly at least a thousand dollars under the figure established previously as a basic figure for the consideration of the United States Government as to what it takes a U.S. family to maintain subsistence living. That is a tremendous disparity. When we are talking about that level of income, $50, $300 means a whole lot, and here we are talking about what amounts to easily a thousand dollars.

DATA GATHERED IN A VAGUE WAY

We got into the question earlier, you got into the question earlier with several people as to what was the figure for Michigan as to the number of children who were eligible, was it 300,000, then we heard 225,000, I think it is very plain that the data the schools use and therefore the State uses and therefore the Feds are able to use in counting up the number of kids who are eligible is done in a very vague way, in a way which is done one way in one school district, another way in the next school district. They count the number of children they determine are eligible for Title I against county figures for the number of families on ADC, against still additional figures which are many times guesses, no accurate, basic systematic scheme of accounting is available, so there is no end to the kinds of figures which might be made up. In fact, between 300,000 to maybe 400,000, back to 225,000, and that is using these very, very low income figures, OES's income figures, for Headstart eligibility, Neighborhood Youth Corps eligibility or anything else, which are, as you know, thirty-eight hundred for a family of four currently, that is $200 under the USDA figures for free lunches which makes it twelve hundred or more dollars under those Federal Government figures for subsistence living. We are talking about real misery. If anybody wants to argue we are going to relate somebody's relative misery to someone else's greater or less misery, we are in the area where there can be only the sense of immoral judgments about how a final determination should be made. We are talking about millions of people, and in Michigan I am certain we are talking about 300,000 as an absolute minimum figure of children right today eligible for free lunches, by a proper logical criteria, not one imposed somehow in the Congress when somehow a figure must be arrived at or the USDA comes up to meet the intent of Congress. People throughout this state, only 29 Community Action Agencies attempt to speak for, provide services to, to mobilize resources for, so that service finally reaches their homes, are consistently being denied in this way, as in many others, that all of you here are aware of, whether it is in the welfare system or in this system. It is a criminal matter and I don't think can be approached any other way, but as Mr. Ruggles said very properly, we have a circumstance where tens of thousands of families are just simply, frankly denied what every other family in somewhat better starts takes for granted, and their kids do not perform in school. They will not be able to perform until they are eating regularly, getting the nutrients that all of us must have to reach minimums of performance.

I think it is proper, too, if you let me make one other point to emphasize the first recommendation on page 12, that no Federal funds be available—

Senator HART. When you go to that one, I noticed it and I was going to be honest with you, I am not prepared to buy that, to speak to it.

INTENDED TO MAKE POINT OF PRIORITIES

Mr. CALL. I do buy it, I think it is a proper point to make because it is intended here to make a point of priorities. Title I money can buy just about any kind of educational material or educational experience for a child, but it has been said many times, here and all kinds of other places, none of those services are going to mean what they could mean unless that child is physically, intellectually capable of receiving the value of those new materials, those additional experiences intended to compensate for his circumstance of poverty, and the easiest way, the readiest way, the one we know how to do and could do with, if the authority were imposed and the money was available, was to see that there was sufficient food flowing to that child every day.

Thank you.

Mr. RUGGLES. Senator Hart, in conclusion I would like to point out that our Association is not attempting now, nor will it ever, to get into the action of feeding children and taking over controls of local school districts or USDA or anyone else, but if we are in the business of helping poor people, that is why we are getting funds from you and other Senators and Congressmen and I think it is damn well right we concern ourselves to the children who are not only completely denied a free lunch or a breakfast, I believe, and I firmly believe, we should have breakfast right along with the school lunch, but also be concerned with the fact that children are denied in many different ways. We talk about statistics, I think Title I statistics are bad and I think CAP Agency statistics are bad, and whatever you are dealing with. We talk about the application form, but we never talk about how that parent is treated when he comes in to apply for that free lunch, and if we are talking about the need to feed them, then we better talk about the positive approach to do that.

NATION'S RIGHT—NO ONE GOES HUNGRY

I think the only way we can get at some of these kinds of problems, whether this first recommendation agrees with your committee or not, is to state it simply, it is a right, it is just a complete right in this country that nobody goes hungry. If we can feed the children at Pakistan, we can feed the children in Alpena. We feel that is an essential right in Michigan. We hope it is felt in this country.

We thank you for allowing us to speak to this Committee today and recognize that maybe a portion of our expertise will get a reaction.

Senator HART. The Committee is grateful it had your counsel, and when I said I am yet to be persuaded on your point No. 1, I certainly don't want to stick other members of the Committee with this, to be persuaded that this is the only lever left. My reservation is the one hope that there are other means, to the fear that I am not yet clear enough on what other adverse consequences will follow if we shut off all federal moneys to schools, this is my reservation. But it is a personal one. I don't speak for the others.

Mr. RUGGLES. When we considered that recommendation, we compared that to other movements in this country, other priorities in this country, and it is a right of any child, no matter what his color, to go to school, if they should shut off public funds to those schools who do not comply with that act, we felt it just as important that no child go there hungry.

Thank you.

Senator HART. I made the analogy in my own mind to that situation. Thank you very much.

Earlier today the Detroit Federation of Teachers, Mary Ellen Riordan was here, she returned and we interrupted negotiations for which she has a responsibility. We are grateful she nonetheless could come.

STATEMENT OF MARY ELLEN RIORDAN, PRESIDENT, DETROIT FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, DETROIT, MICH.

Miss RIORDAN. Thank you very much, Senator Hart, and particularly thank you for your courtesy.

I am sure you cannot have the same personal concern about the necessity of our concluding negotiations as rapidly as possible as we do, but obviously you do have a real concern, and again thank you.

Senator Hart and Committee members.

Thank you for permitting me to address this Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. My name is Mary Ellen Riordan and I am president of the Detroit Federation of Teachers.

We in the Teachers Union are especially appreciative of the investigation being undertaken by this Committee into the area of providing food for school children.

Anyone who has tried to teach or even put up with a small child when he has missed or is late for his regular meal can understand the basis for teachers' concern about teaching hungry children. While older children are generally not as irascible as the little ones, their willingness and ability to concentrate and to learn is equally impaired and their school achievement suffers as a result.

Statistics and general information about the number of children in Detroit who need and are now receiving lunch and/or breakfast, the facilities available, and many of the related problems will no doubt be covered thoroughly and well by a representative from the Detroit Schools Food Service Department. Perhaps you have already heard from him. We will therefore attempt to avoid repetition.

Senator HART. We did hear from him.

Miss RIORDAN. Fine.

We must, however, state again for this record that Detroit probably has the highest percentage of older school buildings of any sizable district in the State of Michigan, and consequently has the greatest problem of inadequate facilities for a food program. Older schools, especially elementary schools, were not built to accommodate more than a handful of children at noon, if provisions were made at all. In Deroit they were expected to have children who went home at noon to at least one of the parents and certainly the rest of the family.

The rapid spread of the Astro-pack lunch is a clear example of the attempts being made in such schools to substitute a cold lunch when a hot lunch is completely out of the question and the children are so obviously in need.

We would like to concentrate our remarks however in an area normally neglected by those concerned with feeding hungry children, an area in which we, as teachers, are vitally concerned since we see some problems from a different, perhaps broader, perspective.

It seems to us that in the very real concern about the food needed by hungry children the equally real human needs for an adequate place to eat and relax in smaller groups and with sufficient adult supervision have been neglected.

Because little or no provision has been made to finance these needs, time has been stolen from the desperately short area of direct school instruction time.

All too often teachers and administrators have been forced into using their time and energy in needs related to food service when they should instead have been spending it in the areas of their specialized education skills.

Time spent in lunchroom or playground supervision cannot be also spent in necessary classroom preparation, in giving small group or individual student help, or in conferences with parents and other teachers about student problems.

More Paraprofessionals May Be Answer

Paraprofessionals who have proved their value in this and other school-related areas have been used in altogether insufficient numbers and assignments when it comes to food service in schools.

Many of our schools at junior and senior high level have such inadequate space, by the way, that serving lunch begins at 10:30 a.m. when the youngsters are hardly two hours away from breakfast and home. The hectic jam through the line continues unabated until 1:15 with each group allotted roughly twenty minutes in the lunchroom from entry to exit. If any snag develops, the entire operation is fouled up and thrown into utter chaos since there is literally no place to "store" students either indoors or out while they are waiting.

A major problem which we believe has been almost totally neglected in the consideration of providing food for school children is the problem of their supervision while eating. The students need an opportunity to relax and talk to friends while eating, but being children, they also need supervision to prevent what frequently starts as teasing or a practical joke between two kids from becoming broad open warfare with food and utensils as weapons.

Such supervision, hopefully, might also encourage the students to taste and eat new foods, including the vegetables, that are served, and perhaps even slip in a lesson now and then on manners and social graces.

Of equal importance in the elementary school is the supervision of the children in the time immediately after lunch and before afternoon classes begin. This is the time allotted for the children normally to go home, to eat, and walk back.

In altogether too many places, the playground space is so small and overcrowded that "fights" and injuries would be guaranteed with the best of children, supervision and intentions.

I can testify from my own personal experience to the dramatic difference when the same number of elementary children at adjacent schools played together after lunch and where one group had almost triple the play space of the other. With the triple play space we didn't need first aid, hardly at all.

In schools when rain, cold, or other weather conditions require an "indoor" noon, the situation is unbelievably even worse.

We are all familiar with descriptions of the increased tensions, frustrations and problems of the experimental rats in overcrowded living conditions. We in the Teachers Union contend that Detroit Schools actually foster similar conditions and results among the students in many of our lunchroom and playground situations, unintentionally, granted, but foster, nevertheless.

To summarize, in the Detroit Public Schools, there is a deep need for greatly increased amounts of food for children, but it must be accompanied with financial support adequate to provide facilities in which to serve the children and sufficient numbers of adults to supervise them.

Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator **Hart**. Thank you, Miss Riordan.

I think the Committee is fortunate to get the position of the teachers as voiced by you in the record. We have heard it in bits and pieces as we have listened to people speaking from various points of view for these two days. You and your associates may have the feeling that there is a lack of understanding on the part of some of those folks of the problems that you are trying to hide behind. It is my impression that they do recognize that your counsel is one of wisdom and is not intended to make more difficult the problem of feeding the children, it is useful as it be in this fashion.

Miss RIORDAN. Thank you very much, Senator. Under no circumstances would we wish to downgrade the necessity of providing food and good nutrition, especially for children. We are so very aware of the decreased learning opportunity that such youngsters have under such circumstances, but it seems so easy to forget somehow that teachers in schools have the especial purpose of educating youngsters in areas other than just good manners and good nutrition during the noon hour. We would grant very quickly that probably we could do a better job than almost anyone else at that, but that is really not the purpose for which we were hired nor is it the purpose for which we are trained and for which we are paid.

Senator HART. Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. CASSIDY. No questions.

Senator HART. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. BECKHAM. No questions.

Mr. KINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have one comment.

We have heard considerable testimony as you have given here relative to the discipline problems and need for supervision. But very little has been said about the sanitary conditions that exist in this kind of piecemeal or makeshift feeding program we are engaged in here.

Miss RIORDAN. I can speak to that eloquently if you would like to hear it. I mentioned the possibility of open warfare using food and utensils as weapons. If you want a better description of a lunchroom I invite you to come into any of ours after such an engagement. It is not an appetizing place for those that follow. Neither is it controllable once it is really started full scale in terms of settling it quickly and cleaning up.

SANITATION IS NIL

But let's take a different situation. Now, one elementary school on the lower east side, for instance, has roughly 700 out of 900 children staying for lunch. They start in the gym, with the gym set up as a lunchroom, before the last class is anywhere near through eating and they are fed through that gym just as rapidly as they can be fed through, using the Astro-Pak lets them get through rather quickly. They go from there back to classrooms, if it is a rainy day or cold or icy and the playground is particularly small. Now, by the time 700 youngsters have gotten through a lunchroom large enough to handle about seventy-five to a hundred at a time, you can picture the situation. There is no time to sweep up in between, and children do spill and drop crumbs, as adults do, and children frequently are not quite as careful as adults.

Mr. KINNEY. Has the State Health or Public Health Service been called in to take a look at the situation?

Miss Riordan. Yes, they come in and we all work in keeping things cleaned up and doing the best we can. In terms of actual sanitation to the point of causing an epidemic of one variety or another, I do not believe our Detroit schools fit that category. In terms of what we think would be best for the youngsters, we are in need of real help.

Mr. Kinney. How about if the city set up a restaurant to run under such conditions to help?

Miss Riordan. We often question whether the State laws would permit employees anywhere else to work the hours that teachers are sometimes required to work in an elementary school, for example, when there is no break for restroom purposes, and there is duty with children at noon where there is sincere concern about the welfare of those youngsters and continued service of those youngsters right on through the afternoon.

Mr. Kinney. Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Chairman, I think in the future we might pay a little attention to this area of trying to get the State Health Department to make some comments along these lines. I think we run the risk of causing an increase, increase the incidence of bacteriological disease if we continue in this manner in the serving of food. Sometimes they serve in the hallway. We have dust particles, people are traveling day in and day out. Even though they make an effort to clean it——

Miss Riordan. Lest there be no misunderstanding, the carts on which food is delivered to the school building have a constant check on temperature when it is hot food, and a constant check on the refrigeration qualities when it is the Astro-Pak, so that in terms of the food being sanitary at the time it is served I truly believe there is no question. My concern has more to do with the surroundings in which the youngsters eat. And the continuing noise and confusion and crowding and rushing that is an accompaniment of their opportunity to eat lunch.

Mr. Kinney. Thank you.

Senator Hart. Thank you very much.

Miss Riordan. Thank you, Senator Hart.

Senator Hart. This concludes the list of witnesses who have been scheduled. However, three have asked to be heard, and the Committee shall. We will have the reporter here so long as possible. He has a plane connection back to Washington he talked to me about last night.

In order of the requests, first from the Detroit Chronicle, Mr. Bill Black.

STATEMENT OF BILL BLACK, DETROIT CHRONICLE

Mr. Black. Thank you, Senator.

First I better make it clear. As they say on radio, any statement I make is my own statement. Any statement I make is my own statement as a private citizen and obviously not endorsed by the newspaper.

I have been sitting in the back since this morning, I am not angry. I grew up in Detroit during the depression when things were hard, but as Mr. Eisenhower said, we were poor but we didn't know it. And with the exception of John Ruggles and his people, I have been angered by most of what I heard otherwise, hardware, delivery systems, separate buildings, centers for feeding. I don't want to step on any toes, but I just talk the way I am. Maybe that is why sometimes I am "big mouth" instead of Bill Black, so I will be "big mouth" today.

I think much of what I have heard is just sheer hogwash, there is a continual problem in this city which you are obviously aware of. Hundreds of our children come to school hungry in the morning and go home hungry in the afternoon. And this isn't the problem of hardware, a separate eating center or anything else, it is the problem of whether the people in the schools care enough to see to it that those children eat an adequate meal at least once a day in the school, no matter how old the school is or how inadequate the feeding facilities are. My wife is a principal of a small school, one and three-tenths miles in one of the poor sections of Detroit. Her kids stay in school and eat because that is the meal and frequently come around the front door after school to get an extra carton of milk because that is the only milk they get. Several years ago there was a public service TV program entitled "Town Hall" or something of that kind. Walter Heller was on it and he was talking about the war on poverty. I recall asking him if he thought enough people cared to make the war on poverty effective, and he said at that time, yes, obviously he did. He was here before the Economic Club last year and I asked him the same question. He shrugged his shoulders and didn't answer.

Senator Hart. On that one, I think just one figure establishes that we did, if you look at the funding of that war it was the most underfunded war we ever fought.

Mr. Black. Someone said earlier sometimes school administrators fail to recognize the serious nutritional problems faced by their children. My only argument is that "their" should have been emphasized, if they are, in fact, "their children", they won't sit back and wait for someone to build a brand new building or rent a church or something like that.

With all this business about hardware and this other bunk, well, wait a minute, I have got just the thing.

I am only going to read a portion of this. It is a commitment order for a man whose trial I covered for the past four weeks, this man was committed to Ionia, he murdered three men, there was no question about it, they found him not guilty by reason of insanity. One sentence from the judge's commitment order reads as follows.

> It is the feeling of this trial court in committing this individual that because of the long-standing mental aberration from which he suffers, namely, schizophrenia of a chronic paranoid nature and which is so advanced because of lack of treatment for over 20 years, that there could never be a favorable prognosis even though there are periods of time when he appears in remission.

The judge recommended this man never get out of Ionia. The first defense witness in his trial was his mother and she testified at no time in his formative years did their family ever have enough to eat.

The psychiatrist who testified for the defense said the scars, emotional, psychological and physical that that man suffered he had never gotten over.

Inadequacy Cycle Leads to Lost Life

I don't know of a more depressing place in this city than the Frank Murphy Hall of Justice Building, it is located in the City of Detroit, as you know. There are no revolving doors but they go in like a revolving door, you can sit in the courtroom and see the cycle. There was one kid, he was inadequately fed, inadequately treated, inadequately educated, no one cared about him, he was a teenager, about 13 or 14, got in trouble, got arrested by a policeman, later on he turns up in the court and he is on the way to Jackson and from there you can forget him.

When people talk statistics, this blown-up statistic you heard about, this 62 percent, it's sheer nonsense. Anyone that wants to question me on it I would be glad to prove it. The business about the white milk in schools. One if the gentlemen that testified about it before this committee, the school across the street from my home, the aid school kids didn't want white milk. Now, whether that had anything to do with the fact that chocolate is beautiful or anything else, I don't know, but this administrator and this outer bureaucrat said no, we just can't do anything else. That's what they told a couple of people from the community when they called, and when they made the same statement to us we told them very flatly, "You will have chocolate milk in this school Monday morning or we will be on the phone to Senator Hart and John Connelly or Jack Newman." And behold, there was chocolate milk there Monday morning. No longer a problem.

I think the same situation exists from the standpoint of giving school lunches. When it was brought up before the Board of Education the superintendent talked about the need to get the Old Roosevelt Annex building and convert it for satellite lunches. Certainly they need facilities, but as one of the young men that was just here before pointed out, the problem here is kids, school kids who don't get enough to eat, and if a few teachers have to get their hands dirty, have to give up their lunch period despite their all-powerful union, what is more important, and who is more important, and how can they expect to do their job if the kid is sitting there hungry?

I live on the west side in the neighborhood I grew up in, I live there by choice. We built a suburban home, and my son said to me, "Pop, what are we running from?" and so we are still there and that is where we're going to stay.

One of my neighbors works a 12-hour day, 6 in the morning until 6 at night, he brings home $108 a week. His kids are scrawny, they are good kids, the man does the best he can. He won't approach the principal of the school in the neighborhood about the school lunch program because he doesn't want to be degraded and the thing that bugs him probably is that the gal who is the principal happens to be black. When I pointed it out to him he said that wasn't his concern. that was the rule and that was the way it had to be. It turns out it was a very degrading situation, and not only that he found out this principal was on welfare and pointed out to him they would make a few changes, he looked at her and she looked at that bureaucratic nonsense of his and said they would get people on this free lunch program without degrading.

HUNGRY CHILDREN COME FIRST

I am saying that if there is anything you can do, we know the problems of the courts, the Senate and the Congress, but one of the points that you need to make to the people here locally is that hungry children come first, not data sheets, not the extra facilities, not extra breaks for teachers. And while you are working in Washington against the odds there, what they can do here is care about those kids. The best way I know to show you care about those kids is to get them to Washington, even if you have to break a rule or bypass a table now and then, feed the kids first. The community will protect them from anything that evolves from that.

I am trying to be cool but I would like to be cussing about some of the things I heard from supposedly civilized men who testified here today, men and women. There is no way anyone in this country can justify having kids come to school hungry in the morning and going home hungry in the afternoon because of a form or lack of a satellite kitchen or anything of the kind.

That is all I have to say.

Senator **HART.** Well, I hope that it reads as eloquently as it sounded. I think it will.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. **CASSIDY.** No questions.

Mr. **BECKHAM.** Just one statement. As I sat here listening, I recalled I saw you back in the corner and you requested a few minutes. I said hello only because we had something in common. I am glad I was here and I am glad we had that one thing in common and you, in fact, said what you did. It makes me feel good and it makes my being here well worth it.

Senator **HART.** Mr. Kinney.

Mr. **KINNEY.** No questions.

Senator **HART.** Thank you, Mr. Black.

Mr. **BLACK.** Thank you, Senator.

Senator **HART.** Next in the progression of those who asked to be heard is Mr. Henry Dodge, Chairman of the Northwest Detroit Council of City and Consumer Associations.

Mr. Dodge.

STATEMENT OF HENRY DODGE, CHAIRMAN, NORTHWEST DETROIT COUNCIL OF CITY AND CONSUMER ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. **DODGE.** Senator Hart, Honorable Members of the Committee.

We are not prepared with the written testimony, we just have a few notes, and the reason being very simple. We had not heard about this meeting until it was publicized on television yesterday. We were not on the preferred list of invitees, and we didn't even know this meeting was going to take place here today until we called your office this morning, where is it taking place. And I am speaking not only for the Northwest Council but for the Greater Detroit Home Owners Council, the Realty Detroit Committee, the Pember Heights Association and many other civic and community groups who I contacted on the phone today and none of them was aware this meeting was taking place.

Senator HART. We are very appreciative you would come in. I know there are many others who asked to be heard, and I regret that our schedule does not permit it. I am glad you are here.

Mr. DODGE. I understand.

At the outset, let me say this, that we are definitely not in favor of any child anywhere on this earth, especially in the United States, and more especially in the City of Detroit, to go hungry for any reason whatsoever. We are more concerned about the breakfast for kids. They might be able to do without a lunch, but what do they do between 7 and 8 in the morning until 12 or 1 o'clock rolls around. Half the day is gone and they are already cranky. We are more concerned about the breakfast and the lunch than we are concerned about food and nutrition in general.

However, I am here to represent people today that could not come here because they are working. They are working to pay the taxes and the freight for all of these free handouts that this government is providing. And they are concerned every time they hear the word "free". Magic word "free". They want to know how do I get in on this free bandwagon, free lunches, free clothing, free busing, free ADC, free health care, free dental care, just about free everything you can imagine.

"INQUISITION" FORMS TOTALLY WRONG

Our people don't know what this word means. We have mothers that deprive themselves of nice dresses. We have fathers that don't eat steak, they eat hamburger to provide the kid a decent lunch, decent clothes to go to school. We have people that are too proud to fill out this inquisition form as to what the family income is. They put down name, address and phone number and that is all. And I think that this inquisition form is totally wrong. I am talking about the form that every parent has to fill out at the beginning of every school year for every school child as to what his family status and income is. I don't believe it is any of the school's business. A citizen files a tax return, it is required by law, and that's it. It is between him and Uncle Sam and the State government, whoever the tax collector is. I don't think the school has got any business to find out what the financial condition at home is. I believe that the rights to a free lunch, a paid lunch or no lunch at all should be equal for all kids.

On the other hand, let us look at it this way. Society today knows two telephone numbers when anything goes wrong. You either call the school or you call the police. They have no other phone number. If they need a city physician they call the police to take them there. If they have trouble with the kid, something must have happened in school. It is that simple. These are the only two agencies they know how to refer their problems to, and I think both of these agencies are overburdened and overworked. Our policemen have become social workers, they are not law enforcement agents any more. This is unfortunate. You know what the crime picture in Detroit is.

As far as the schools are concerned, we expect too much from the schools. We believe the basic responsibility of the schools is to educate, and they are doing everything but that. The number of dedicated teachers is too few. We are talking about a lunch program here. You have heard from other speakers what the difficulties are as to the lack of facilities, I cannot deny that these statements are correct, because they basically are.

However, the taxpayers are getting alarmed at the growing army of nonteaching staff that our schools are acquiring. You see what happens to the millages whenever they appear in municipalities, I think about 70 percent of them go down to defeat and this should be a message.

TAXPAYERS' REVOLT GROWING

There is a taxpayer revolt growing here in the City of Detroit especially, and in the State of Michigan in general. Perhaps you have heard about taxpayers revolts before, but I think this is a real one. About two or three years ago, I forget the exact date, some organization calling themselves "The Taxpayers Rights", I believe they operated out of Jackson or Kalamazoo, started a statewide petition on a constitutional amendment which was almost successful, but they missed their deadline, and that constitutional amendment was very simple, it merely said no taxes shall be imposed unless specifically approved by the people. And there is talk about starting the constitutional amendment going around again. This is how fed up people are.

The governor is proposing a 1.3 percent tax increase. This is misleading. It is a 50 percent tax increase in our State taxes, we already are paying a higher income tax in Detroit than any other city in the State of Michigan, to be specific, government, and in most cases most other municipalities have no local income tax. It becomes a question now should the schools be burdened with feeding those kids. Well, let's look at it this way. Being that we are talking about human needs, we cannot separate nutrition from human needs and our welfare system in general. These families that are on welfare today are usually not there for the first generation, it is the second, third and fourth welfare generation that has become a way of life. Many people have said, well, if the mother can't take care of the kids, why should the kids suffer, it isn't fair. The kid is in this world due to no choice of his own, but something has to be done for the kid as well as for the mother. All right, place him in a foster home. This is fine, but there aren't enough foster parents around, so the next thing you have to do is create some state schools for indigent kids, not training schools, not punitive schools, but schools where they can get a proper education and proper supervision and the next best thing to parental care.

What will this do? It will give the kids a break and it will remove those kids from the mothers and be less of an inducement for ADC and welfare money so that this sort of a thing will tend to stop by itself eventually, we hope, because there will be no inducement on the mother's part to have more children if she isn't going to benefit from ADC benefits she will receive.

FEED CHILDREN WITHOUT BURDENING SCHOOLS

Now, we are at a loss to say, Senator, go ahead with the free lunch program or don't. We say this to you. Feed the kids but don't overburden the schools and change this whole welfare and ADC system. This is our message to you from the people that are working today and can't afford to be here.

Senator HART. Thank you, Mr. Dodge. I am glad we share the conviction that we are obligated to see that there are no hungry children, and we share the responsibility of trying to find out the way most effectively to insure that there aren't any.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Dodge, do you believe that women have children to receive ADC?

Mr. DODGE. Yes, very definitely so.

Senator HART. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. BECKHAM. No questions.

Senator HART. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. KINNEY. I don't have any real questions. I would just like to ask one thing here.

Do I take it that you support some kind of welfare reform?

Mr. DODGE. I definitely support some type of reform that would put people to work and eventually make themselves self-sustaining and get them off the welfare rolls, give them some type of way out to where they can become self-respecting citizens to where they will want to get off the welfare rolls themselves. Put them on a part-time job, train them to do something, but don't take their welfare money away for every dollar they earn gainfully. Let them get up to a certain standard to where they can do something to help themselves and perhaps enter the mainstream of society where they can become useful citizens.

Mr. KINNEY. Thank you.

Senator HART. Thank you very much.

Mr. DODGE. Thank you for your time, Senator.

Senator HART. And the last of the three citizens who asked to be heard from the Consumer Alliance, Lynn Ehrle.

STATEMENT OF LYNN EHRLE, VICE PRESIDENT, CONSUMER ALLIANCE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. EHRLE. Thank you, Senator.

I am Lynn Ehrle, L-y-n-n, E-h-r-l-e, vice president of the Consumer Alliance of Michigan, a newly-formed organization in Michigan. Our first annual meeting was held in March in Lansing and we represent well over 30 organizations and unions and credit unions right now, and several hundred members individually.

My purpose in coming before the Committee this afternoon is to voice the concern of consumers, and I certainly wish to commend you, Senator Hart, for all you have done on behalf of the consumers.

It is personally with a sense of outrage and innerrage that I come before this Committee, the first time I have had an opportunity to address such a body. I, as you have, have gone through the experience of witnessing the group sent by the Southern Regional Council into the Delta Region in Mississippi and the startling testimony of children in America starving, right in the heartland of the South and in the farm land, cotton regions, and we also witnessed further testimony coming out of the Carolinas relative to starvation and malnutrition, those areas.

And then we have witnessed even further some devastating medical reports which showed the intense deprivation that results in mental deficiencies from a lack of nutrition. My concern, I guess, is of immediacy and the consumers in Michigan I am sure many of them feel there needs to be a reordering of priorities and I know you are working desperately on this problem yourself. I would hope that you and your subcommittee and the other committees working in this particular area could somehow communicate the desperation of the need. I as a well-fed white person cannot even communicate this desperation, but there is certainly empathy in my own attitude towards persons who are less fortunate than I, less fortunate than most of us in this room today, and I would hope that quiet desperation that these people we know must feel in their own hearts and their own families when they go home at night trying to maintain a sense of decency for their own children, to bring them up in a world that has some minimal opportunities for them, these persons must be facing a terrible psychological struggle. And so I would hope that the urgency of this meeting somehow could be communicated.

MISLEADING MASS MEDIA HARMFUL

There is one further brief point I would touch upon, and that is when our young people are brought up in a mass communication market today with mass media pushing the messages at them, what chance does the school have to get its message of nutrition across, even if they do provide some minimal process of lunchroom facilities. It may be too late at this point if our nutritional studies are correct. The malnutrition and the brain damage has already been effected at this particular point. And so we have an even more critical problem, and this problem of the media continually pumping at us, here is a product that is nutritional, you just eat this and everything will be OK., Zippity Do-da Cereal and you will be on top of the world the rest of the day. The problem of advertising and the mass media bombarding us continually with these messages, it has been said a mother in her own home with a child under the age of 18 can give the child at every meal possibly some 3,000 messages, but the television set bombarding that same child gives that person over 6,000 messages relative to food and nutrition in the life of that young child, so there is this other aspect of the problem that I would lay before your body and hope that you might be cognizant of the interrelationships here. This is the critical nature of the problem. It is interrelated with other more serious and more major problems that must be attacked on the priority question.

So I again thank you for the opportunity of Consumer Alliance to appear before this group and express our concern and hope you can effect some solutions to these pressing problems.

Senator Hart. Thank you very much.

I think you strike, as we close, a note that is useful. Lifting, if you will, a little from the focus of the hungry child to a relationship that so many of these elements, some of which you mention, bear to it.

Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy. No questions.

Senator Hart. Mr. Beckham.

Mr. Beckham. No questions.

Senator Hart. Mr. Kinney.

Mr. Kinney. No questions.

Senator Hart. Thank you very much.

It would be inexcusable, as we close, if I did not repeat for the Select Committee our appreciation to everyone who joined in the effort, both yesterday and today, to make a record such as the one we close now. Today, particularly, I think we should acknowledge again the contribution that Mrs. Mahaffey made in construction of this record. I appreciate also, of course, the contributions that have been made by each of these members on the staff.

I think the hearings have been useful. They certainly are not at an end. One is tempted, and perhaps would succumb to the temptation if the reporter didn't have to flee to the airport, to make some effort of preparation.

I think the remarks of what we have heard today speak pretty eloquently to the need underlying the whole problem, I am sure, even on the part of those of us who insist we do understand a lack of will. One can only hope that we can figure out what it is that is required to insure that there are no hungry children.

And finally, the reality of poverty I am sure can never be understood if you haven't been in poverty. But the facts about poverty can be and should be understood by everybody, and that is part of the problem.

Again thank you very much.

The Select Committee is in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 4:30 p.m., the Select Committee was recessed, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1

ITEMS PERTINENT TO THE LANSING HEARING

ITEM 1. MATERIAL SUPPLIED BY THE WITNESSES

FROM ALAN W. HOUSEMAN

[From the Clearinghouse Review, January 1971]

I. IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

In almost every state in the country, and particularly in the Northeast and Midwest, there are still many schools without a School Lunch Program. The failure to implement programs, particularly in impoverished areas, is mainly attributable to the limited enlightenment and misplaced priorities of educators. In most cases they have either failed to comprehend the incontrovertible relationship between adequate nutrition and the ability to learn, or they have decided that poor children's nutritional concerns should take a back seat to political priorities established by the richer community. However, there are other reasons which are frequently asserted by school administrators, the most common being the absence of cafeteria and kitchen facilities.

While it is true that many schools do not presently have the equipment or facilities to prepare mid-day meals, it does not necessarily follow that those schools are unable to operate a Lunch Program. Quite the contrary. A school district which does not have kitchen facilities in all of its schools can still operate a Lunch Program through one or a combination of several different methods. It can: (1) set up a satellite feeding system; (2) establish a central kitchen program; (3) provide meals through a catering service; or (4) distribute cold lunches. Each method of Program implementation differs in desirability, but all of them at least make nutritious food available.[9]

If a school district prefers to purchase facilities and equipment, so that every school has a self-contained school lunch operation, then substantial amounts of federal money will be made available to help subsidize such purchases. The most important federal sources of funding for this purpose are: § 5 of the School Lunch Act and § 5 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966;[10] the special School Lunch Program authorizations from § 32 of the 1935 Agricultural Act;[11] and Title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (hereinafter E.S.E.A.).[12] In addition, state funds may also be available to purchase equipment for the implementation of School Lunch Programs. In short, for school districts that are determined to feed needy children, there are ample methods and resources available to assure mid-day meals for everyone.

---

[9] The *satellite feeding system* is presently in operation in many cities, most notably in Detroit. Under this method of Program implementation, a school with kitchen facilities prepares and cooks food for the schools without such equipment; the food is transported from the base kitchen to the satellite schools by trucks which contain hot trays to keep the food warm. The *central kitchen program*—presently in operation in New York City's elementary schools—works very similarly. Under this system, a central commissary is established, in a building not otherwise used for educational purposes, which cooks and prepares food for the schools without facilities; once again, the food is transported in specially-equipped trucks so that the food is kept warm. Through the *catering service* method of Program implementation, outside food companies are hired to prepare meals for the school system, similar to the way airlines have food prepared for their passengers. Although this method of operation was previously outlawed by the United States Department of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as U.S.D.A.), the Department has recinded its restrictive regulations and now, in fact, encourages the utilization of catering services. *See* Fed. Reg. 807, 3704(1969). Finally, the *distribution of cold lunches* is often used as an inexpensive method of distributing mid-day meals. Although federal nutritional requirements for cold and hot lunches are identical, *see* 7 C.F. R. § 210.10, as newly codified, experiences with cold lunch distributions in St. Louis and Washington, D.C. indicate that this method of Program implementation is least desirable; children find the meals less tasty and, therefore, often do not pick up their school lunches.

If political and community organizing efforts fail to force the district to establish School Lunch Programs in every school, then litigation efforts must ensue. To date, despite the unfortunate decision in *Briggs v. Kerrigan*, 307 F. Supp. 295 (D. Mass. 1969), *aff'd per curiam*, ——— F. 2d ——— (1st Cir., 1970), 4 Clearinghouse Rev. 34 (May 1970), Clearinghouse No. 2157, litigation campaigns have been very successful. As a direct result of law suits, for example, the Detroit School Board agreed to implement a School Lunch Program in 70 inner-city schools,[13] and the Milwaukee School Board agreed to expand its School Lunch Program.[14] In Pueblo, Colorado, the defendant school board agreed to implement a school lunch program in all of its Title I—the poorest—schools,[15] and the Chicago School Board agreed to add numerous inner-city schools to its mid-day food services program.[16] Similar success is expected in several other suits that have been filed recently.

For a district that has a School Lunch Program in some of its schools, but not in others, three basic theories should usually be utilized, depending upon the facts in the case, to show that the district is out of conformity with statutory, regulatory and constitutional dictates.[17] By providing free lunches to some impoverished children—in the schools that have a Lunch Program—but refusing to provide them to the indigent plaintiffs—attending schools without food services—the defendants are usually violating federal law in three ways. First, they are violating the National School Lunch Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder insofar as the defendants are required to provide free lunches *to all eligible needy school children* in the district.[18] Second, they are violating the National School Lunch Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder insofar as the defendants must establish school lunch programs in the neediest schools first and provide free lunches to the neediest children first.[19] Finally, they are violating the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment insofar as the defendants provide free lunches to some needy children but arbitrarily refuse to provide free lunches to the plaintiffs and all other indigents in plaintiffs' shools.

For purposes of illustration, the following hypothetical, representative of the situation found in many, if not most, school districts in the country, shall be used in considering Part I, subparts A, B and C, *infra:* School district X has implemented a School Lunch Program in schools 1, 2 and 3, but has refused to provide a mid-day feeding program in schools 4, 5 and 6. Plaintiffs, of course, attend schools 4, 5 and 6. They bring an action to force the school board to implement a Lunch Program in their schools so that they can receive free mid-day meals.

---

[10] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1754 and 1774. In Fiscal 1969–70, $15 million was appropriated under the two "non-food assistance" sections of the School Lunch Act and Child Nutrition Act; for this fiscal year, the same amount has been appropriated. (This will probably be increased by over $2 million pursuant to a pending appropriations bill in the House of Representatives.)

[11] *See* 7 U.S.C. § 612(c). This source of funding is commonly referred to as either "Perkins money"—named after its major proponent, House Education and Labor Committee Chairman Carl Perkins–or "Section 32." In Fiscal 1969-70, $90 million was appropriated under this section for the School Lunch Program; for Fiscal 1970-71, the appropriation has been raised to $156 million.

[12] *See* 20 U.S.C. §§ 241a *et seq.* In Fiscal 1969-70, Congress appropriated approximately $1.33 billion for Title I; out of this amount, about $30 million was used for implementing School Lunch Programs. This fiscal year, over $1.5 billion was appropriated for Title I. Although this means that a substantial increase in money will be available under this section for School Lunch Program purposes, it is this writer's feeling that Title I funds should not, if possible, be used to set up child feeding programs. Since these funds are primarily intended to improve poor children's educational opportunities, Title I funds are probably best expended for other educationally-related programs. Nevertheless, these funds can be utilized to establish School Lunch and/or Breakfast Programs.

[13] Kennedy v. The Detroit School Board, Civil Action No. 33367 (E.D. Mich.), Clearinghouse No. 2318A to E.

[14] Gully v. Board of Schools of Milwaukee, Civil Action No. 69 C 468 (E.D. Wis filed Oct. 10, 1969), 3 Clearinghouse Rev. 199 (December 1969), Clearinghouse No. 2490A.

[15] Ayala v. She District 60 School Board of Pueblo, Colorado, Civil Action No. C–2067 (D. Colo., filed Feb. 6, 1970), Clearing house No. 2991A, B.

[16] Stogner v. Page, Civil Action No. 69 C 1338 (N.D. Ill., 1970), 3 Clearinghouse Rev. 304 (March 1970), Clearilinghouse No. 2095.

[17] This article will not consider the problem of school districts in which there is no School Lunch Program at all. This is a more complex issue which has not, at the date of this writing, been tested in the courts. However, the arguments are similar to those discussed herein, and cases challenging this blanket refusal to implement Programs are now being prepared.

[18] *See* 7 C.F.R. § 245.3 (a); 42 U.S.C. § 1758.

[19] *See* 7 C.F.R. § 245.4; 42 U.S.C. §§ 1757, 1758 and 1759a.

A. The Refusal to Provide Free Lunches to All Impoverished Children in the School District Violates the School Lunch Act and the Regulations Promulgated Thereunder.

The essential predicate for this cause of action is the eligibility of the plaintiffs for free lunches according to the school district's income eligibility criteria. The only reason, then, that the plaintiffs would not be receiving their free lunch entitlements is because they attend a school that has no mid-day food services whatsoever. This being the case, the most important applicable regulation is found at 7 C.F.R. § 245.3 Subpart (a) of that section, in its entirety, states:

> Each school food authority[20] shall serve lunches free or at a reduced price to all children whom it determines, in accordance with the requirements of this part, are unable to pay the full price of the lunch. The criteria used by the school food authority in making such determinations shall be included in standards of eligibility which shall be approved by the State, or F.N.S.R.O. [the Food and Nutrition Services Regional Office] where applicable, as part of the policy statement required under § 245.10 of this part, and shall be publicly announced in accordance with the provisions of § 245.5 of this part. Such standards shall specify the specific criteria to be used, respectively, for free lunches and for reduced priced lunches; *they shall be applicable to all schools under the jurisdiction on the school food authority; and they shall provide that all children from a family meeting the eligibility standards and attending any school under the jurisdiction of the school food authority shall be provided the same benefits.* (Emphasis added.)

The literal requirements under this regulation are patently clear: If a school food authority—*i.e.* the school board—wants federal funds under the School Lunch Act, it must establish eligibility criteria for the provision of free lunches. Every child going to school in the district—no matter which school that child attends—who is eligible under the school board's eligibility criteria, must receive a free school lunch. No child in the district who is eligible for free meals pursuant to the school board's criteria can be denied his or her free lunch entitlements.

Senator McGovern, the principal congressional proponent of the May, 1970 School Lunch Act amendments,[21] underscored the meaning of the regulation and indicated how it squares with congressional intent.[22] After quoting portions of 7 C.F.R. § 245.3, he stated:

> This clearly is consistent with the intent of Congress to extend the program benefits to every needy child and the program itself to every school. And the regulations now clearly emphasize that *when one school in a school district serves lunch, then all other schools in that district must provide equal treatment in nutritional services for all needy children.* . . . [A]ll is clear now. *Every needy child shall be served a free or reduced-price lunch.* That is the law. 116 Cong. Rec. S16141 (daily ed. Sept. 22, 1970) (emphasis added).

In applying the above-cited regulatory provision to the hypothetical case herein, it becomes obvious that the defendants are violating federal requirements. Since our hypothetical plaintiffs are eligible for free mid-day meals (pursuant to the district's income eligibility criteria), the defendants are obligated to provide plaintiffs with their free lunch entitlements. Defendants may not provide free lunches in some schools—pursuant to their free lunch eligibility criteria—and refuse lunches to similarly needy children solely because they attend another school. Such administration of the Program is blatantly violative of regulatory requirements that the free lunch eligibility criteria must be applicable in all of the district's schools, "that when one school in a school district serves lunch, then all other schools in the district must provide equal nutritional services for all needy children."[23]

---

[20] The federal regulations clearly set forth the definition of the term "school food authority":

"School food authority" means *the governing body which is responsible for the administration of one or more schools and which has the legal authority to operate a lunch program therein.* The "school food authority" also includes a nonprofit agency to which such governing body has delegated authority for the operation of a lunch program in a school. 7 C.F.R. § 210.2(p) (emphasis added).

Consequently, "school food authority" usually denotes the district's school board.

[21] Pub. L. No. 91-248 (May 14, 1970).

[22] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1758.

B. The Refusal to Provide Free Lunches to the Neediest Children First, and the Refusal to Establish School Lunch Programs in the Neediest Schools First, Is Violative of the National School Lunch Act and the Regulations Promulgated Thereunder.

In most school districts, choices as to which schools should be included—and which schools should be excluded—from the School Lunch Program are made wholly without regard to comparative need. Most frequently, choices are made based on logistical or political factors such as which schools have kitchen facilities, or which schools have principals who are sympathetic to mid-day feeding programs. The net result is, almost inevitably, that schools in impoverished neighborhoods do not have a School Lunch Program while schools in more affluent communities provide federally-subsidized meals. This pattern of Program implementation, which is in evidence in many school districts throughout the country, flies in the face of congressional intent. Impoverished students may not be left hungry, undernourished and unfed while their more generously-endowed peers eat off the taxpayer's purse.

Under the National School Lunch Act, Congress established a "poverty priority" that sought to guarantee that impoverished children would be properly fed. Although the School Lunch Program could be available to all children, needy or affluent, statutory requirements of expenditure and administration required that poor children be given a priority in Program benefits. The reason for establishing this "poverty priority" was suggested in the *Senate Report to the 1946 Act:*

> [L]arge segments of our population have insufficient means to provide proper food. Studies indicate that this is true, even in times of general prosperity such as we are now experiencing. A large part of the population does not benefit by rising national income, being for various reasons held to a fixed income. S. Rep. No. 553, 79th Cong., 1st Sess. 9 (1945).

The congressional poverty priority is most clearly envinced by the statutorily required flow of federal subsidies to the poorest areas so that the poorest children would be fed first. Section 4 of the Act[24] bases the amounts to be given to the states on their "assistance need rate,[25] thus giving a greater proportion of "general assistance" school lunch funds to states with lower per capita incomes. Section 7,[26] as amended, by basing "special assistance" disbursements on the number of children from households receiving less than $4.000 a year, gives a greater proportion of such funds to the poorest states. Within the state, § 8,[27] which bases, disbursements on the factor "need and attendance," provides that schools with the greatest need shall have a priority in the funds disbursed.[28] In addition, § 11(e)[29] requires that disbursements to schools be based on their need, as determined by the financial strain of feeding low-income children for free. Section 9[30] provides for free or reduced price lunches to needy children, and requires that "[i]n providing meals free or at reduced cost to needy children, first priority shall be given to providing free meals to the neediest children." Finally, § 11[31] provides special funding for § 9.

What emerges is a continual chain of "poverty priorities," evincing the congressional concern that poor children—those with the greatest need for assistance—receive the greatest share of the federal lunch funds.[32] Within the Union, poor states are given a preference; within a state, poor schools are given a preference; within a school, poor children are given a preference. The rationale for this funding formula of "poverty priorities" was indicated by Congressman Voorhis:

---

[23] 116 Cong. Rec. S16141 (daily ed. Sept, 22, 1970) (Remarks by Senator McGovern). *See* 7 C.F.R. § 245.3(a); 42 U.S.C. § 1758.

[24] 42 U.S.C. § 1753.

[25] "Assistance need rate" is defined in § 12 (d)(6) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1760(d)(6).

[26] 42 U.S.C. § 1759a(c).

[27] 42 U.S.C. § 1757.

[28] Pursuant to the recently promulgated federal regulations, states must assure that School Lunch Program funds shall be used to "extend the Program to every school within the State. *giving priority to schools in areas with a high concentration of needy children.*" 7 C.F.R. § 210.4a(b)(5)(ii) (emphasis added).

[29] 42 U.S.C. § 1759a(e).

[30] 42 U.S.C. § 1758.

[31] Section 11a (42 U.S.C. § 1759a(a)) authorizes sufficient funds to feed needy children, throughout the country, with free or reduced price lunches.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for each succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to provide special assistance to assure access to the School Lunch Program under this Act by children of low-income families.

[32] Senator Russell, speaking about past school lunch efforts and the pending National School Lunch Act, stated: "Mr. President, since its inception this program has been based on need. . . . I do not think a program of this kind could be justified if it were not based on need." 92 Cong. Rec. 1616 (1946).

> [U]nder the school lunch program, such as this bill contemplates, it will be possible to encourage the inauguration of school lunch programs by the local people in the places where they are most needed, and in the places where they have been least in evidence. . . . We would be glad, indeed, if, as the formula in this bill provides, the food could be gotten into lunches for those school children of this nation who need it most no matter where they can be found. 92 Cong. Rec. 1471 (1946).

It certainly would have been anomalous for Congress to set up the School Lunch Program differently. With regard to the National School Lunch Program, congressional concern for the needy and impoverished has been consistent and steadfast.[33] Congress wished to assure that the poor would not be left unfed while the more affluent—those already endowed with greater access to proper nutrition—received federaly-subsidized school lunches:

> The first purpose of the school-lunch program was to help use up surplus farm products in the most useful way possible—*to feed little children who otherwise might not have had a square meal a day.*[34] 92 Cong. Rec. 1453 (1943) (Remarks by Congressman Sabath) (emphasis added).

Contrary to the plain meaning of the Act and the clear intent of Congress, many school districts have refused to adhere to the "poverty priority;" they have refused to establish School Lunch Programs in the neediest areas first. Instead, most school boards' selection of school for inclusion and exclusion in the Lunch Program resembles a crazy-quilt that is wholly unrelated to need. In so doing, these school boards are breaking the congressional "poverty priority" chain to the neediest schools. By refusing to establish School Lunch Programs, these school boards are refusing to disburse funds on a priority basis to the schools serving the most impoverished neighborhoods. This constitutes a direct violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1757 and 1759a(e). In so doing, they are violating the statutory directive that "first priority shall be given to providing free meals to the neediest children."[35]

Probably the best way to determine whether the defendants are violating the "poverty priority" is by examining the school district's applications for Title I funds (under the E.S.E.A.). By definition, schools eligible for Title I funds are in the neighborhoods with the highest concentration of low-income children. If the Title I schools do not have a School Lunch Program, while the non-Title I schools provide mid-day meals, it is probably easy to show that the "poverty priority" is not being complied with. Moreover, since Title I applications must indicate the percentage of poor children in the "target schools," it is statistically possible to prove how grievously a school board has deviated from the "poverty priority."

C. The Refusal to Provide Free Lunches—on the Arbitrary and Irrational Basis of School Attended—Violates the Equal Protection Dictates of the Fourteenth Amendment.

---

[33] Congressional priorities for the indigent have been clearly manifested in the child-feeding legislation of the past two and a half decades. The 1946 Act required that needy children be fed for free or at a reduced cost. U.S.C. § 1758. The 1962 amendments to the Act established "special assistance" funds to subsidize "the service of lunches to children unable to pay the full cost of such lunches." 42 U.S.C. § 1759a(c). In 1966, Congress passed the Child Nutrition Act which, *inter alia*, established the School Breakfast Program, provided funds for purchasing equipment and facilities for operating additional School Lunch Programs, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1771 *et seq.* In that Act, a congressional priority was established for providing adequate nutrition in the poorest areas first. *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1773(c), 1773(e), and 1774(a). In 1968, Congress enacted the Vanik Bill that established a child feeding program in day-care centers, settlement houses, recreation centers, and other "service institutions." That legislation, as well, placed primary emphasis on feeding needy and impoverished children. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1761(a)(1), 1761(b)(2) and 1761(f).

[34] Congressman Holfield further underscored the primary congressional concern for the poor:

> This bill provides for a permanent school lunch program for the benefit of the children of America, *for those children whose income is too small to give them proper nutrition.* 92 Cong. Rec. 1468 (1946) (emphasis added).

[35] 42 U.S.C. § 1758. The federal regulations underscored the clear congressional requirements that free lunches should be provided to the neediest children first:

> Section 245.3. Priority for the neediest children. In providing free or reduced price lunches to children meeting the eligibility standards for such lunches, school food authorities [*i.e.*, the school board] shall give first priority to providing free lunches to the neediest children in the schools under their jurisdiction.

Inter alia, this means that the poorest children may not be deprived of their free lunch entitlements due to the defendants' refusal to provide a Lunch Program in their schools, while less needy children, attending schools that provide food services, receive free mid-day meals.

The constitutional claim, in this context, is clear and straightforward. Plaintiffs are in dire need, and are poor enough to be eligible for free lunches. Although other children in the school district receive free lunches, the impoverished plaintiffs are denied their free lunch entitlements solely because the school board refuses to implement a School Lunch Program in plaintiffs' schools. Distinguishing plaintiffs from other children similarly situation, *solely because of the school they attend,* constitutes an arbitrary discrimination, without relation to the central purpose of the School Lunch Act—the relief of hunger and the consequent improvement of educational opportunities—or to any other legitimate state and federal goal.

Any distinction in the provision of Program benefits "must be based on differences that are reasonably related to the purposes of the Act. . . ."[36] Discrimination in the provision of free lunches on the accidental basis of school of attendance—in the same school district—cannot meet this test. There must be a showing that school of attendance is rationally related to the relief of hunger before it can be used as the basis for depriving plaintiffs of their free lunch entitlements. It is doubtful that this can be shown; consequently, the school district's deprivation of free mid-day meals is violative of equal protection.[37]

---

[36] Morey v. Doud, 354 U.S. 457, 465 (1957). *See also* Gulf. Colorado and Santa Fe Ry. v. Ellis, 165 U.S. 150, 190 (1897); Carrington v. Rash, 380 U.S. 89, 92-93 (1965).

[37] One case, argued prior to the May, 1970 School Lunch Act amendments, has found differently, however. In Briggs v. Kerrigan, 307 F. Supp. 295 (D. Mass, 1969), *aff'd per curiam,* ——— F.2d ——— (1st Cir. 1970), 4 Clearinghouse Rev. 34 (May 1970), Clearinghouse No. 2157, plaintiffs' challenged the Boston School Board's failure to implement a School Lunch Program in numerous elementary schools. The district court carefully noted that "in Boston the sole determinant for participation in the National Shool Lunch Program is the presence or absence of kitchen and lunchroom facilities either on the premises or nearby." 307 F. Supp. at 299. Schools participating in the Lunch Program either had facilities or were contiguous "to schools in which facilities were not being used to capacity." *Id.* As a result, the court concluded:

> The basis of the classification, *i.e.,* the reason for the different treatment, is not arbitrary or capricious. The decision not to undertake immediate sizeable capital expenditures to provide cafeteria facilities in nonparticipating schools or to build central kitchens and maintain trucking services to these schools so that lunches would be available to all that might need them, even in light of the harshness of its results to some grammar school pupils, is not so unreasonable as to reach constitutional dimensions. 307 F. Supp. at 303.

It is certainly questionable whether this holding could withstand scrutiny in *light of recent developments that occurred after this case was argued,* particularly the passage of the 1970 School Lunch Act amendments and the increased Federal Lunch appropriations. As indicated above, the implementation of School Lunch Programs is not dependent upon the presence of kitchen facilities. Moreover, present federal funding levels for both operational and capital School Lunch Program expenditures have increased so substantially that it is no longer valid to say that the implementation of child feeding programs requires "sizeable capital expenditures" out of local funds. Present funding levels, for Fiscal 1970–71, include: $200.4 million for "special assistance" School Lunch Program funds pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1759a—an increase of $155.6 million from the previous fiscal year; $225 million for "general assistance" School Lunch Program funds pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1753—an increase of $57 million from the previous fiscal year; $156 million for supplemental appropriations out of "Section 32"—an increase of $66 million from the previous fiscal year; $1.5 billion from Title I of the E.S.E.A.—an increase of approximately $167 million from the previous fiscal year; and $15 to $17 million for "non-food assistance" pursuant to § 5 of the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act.

Aside from changes in the School Lunch Program since *Briggs,* the decision may well be wrong since it contradicts the Supreme Court's holding in Shapiro v. Thompson, 394 U.S. 618 (1969), 3 Clearinghouse Rev. 1 (May 1969), Clearinghouse No. 238. In its ruling that the durational residence requirements for public assistance violated equal protection, the Court held that discriminatory treatment cannot be constitutionally rectified on the basis of preserving the State or local fisc. The Court said:

> We recognize that a State has a valid interest in preserving the fiscal integrity of its programs. It may legitimately attempt to limit its expenditures, whether for public assistance, public education, or any other program. But a State may not accomplish such a purpose by invidious distinctions between classes of its citizens. It could not, for example, reduce expenditures for education by barring indigent children from its schools. Similarly, in the cases before us, appellants must do more than show that denying welfare benefits to new residents saves money. The saving of welfare costs cannot be an independent ground for an invidious classification. 394 U.S. at 633.

The decision in *Briggs*—although the opinion therein claims otherwise—is clearly contradictory to the holding in *Shapiro.* Stripped to its essentials, the only defense for not providing lunches to the plaintiffs was the defendants' refusal to expend some local money. This, as the *Shapiro* Court held, is a constitutionally inadequate basis for discriminatory treatment.

The *Briggs* decision, even if upheld in future cases, seems limited in its applicability. At the end of its opinion, the district court expressly indicated that the decision would have been different if school lunch denials were not based on logistical considerations, 307 F. Supp. at 304. Thus, if schools with kitchen facilities did not have a School Lunch Program, the decision would have been different. Conversely, if the school district implemented Lunch Programs regardless of proximity to facilities, then decision would also have been different. Consequently, many school districts–in which School Lunch Program implementation patterns are different from Boston's–could not rely on *Briggs* as a valid defense for their free lunch denials.

Even after *Dandridge v. Williams*, 397 U.S. 471 (1970), it may well be that discriminatory denials of food assistance—in the School Lunch Program context—would be vigilantly scrutinized with a more stringent standard than the ordinary "rational relation" test. This is because the injury to the plaintiffs is of the utmost seriousness. Not only are the impoverished plaintiffs' lives, health, spirit and growth susceptible to injury because of inadequate nutrition, but their educational advancement is also jeopardized: a child's ability to learn is severely limited when he is hungry.[38] The critical importance of education in our society—and the tragic consequences of limited opportunities to learn—underscore why discriminatory deprivations of school lunch entitlements should receive a court's most ardent protection.[39] As the Supreme Court stated in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, 493 (1954):

> Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principle instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

The need for special judicial protection, when equal educational opportunities are involved, has been underscored in numerous cases. As summarized in *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education*, 294 F. 2d 150 (5th Cir. 1961), *cert. denied*, 368 U.S. 930 (1961), the critical importance of educational opportunities is clear:

> It requires no argument to demonstrate that education is vital and, indeed, basic to civilized society. Without sufficient education the plaintiffs would not be able to earn an adequate livelihood to enjoy life to the fullest or to fulfill as completely as possible the duties and responsibilities of good citizens. 294 F. 2d at 156.

Whatever the standard utilized for scrutinizing defendants' discriminatory deprivations, it would seem that school of attendance is too spurious and arbitrary a basis for denying plaintiffs their free lunch entitlements. As a result, such school lunch denials are violative of the fourteenth amendment.

II. THE PROVISION OF FREE LUNCHES TO NEEDY CHILDREN

In § 9 of the 1946 School Lunch Act, the Congress required that school lunches "shall be served without cost or at a reduced cost to children who are determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full cost of the lunch."[40] Although this language demonstrated congressional intent that the poor should not be excluded from school meals due to an inability to pay, the standards for administering this provision were most unclear: How should a school district determine inability to pay? Are there any minimal free lunch standards, either nationally or regionally? What is a reduced price lunch?

As a result of this confusion, almost every school district in the country refused to provide free lunches to the neediest children. Many school districts had no free lunch standards whatsoever; others had standards that were so inadequate that almost no one in the district qualified for free meals. Still others had policies that precluded all welfare children from receiving free or reduced price meals.[41] Consequently, the "free lunch" provision of the School Lunch Act was a nullity.[42]

---

[38] *Hearings on 1970 School Lunch Act Amendments Before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs*, 91st Cong., 1st Sess., pt 2 (1969); *Hunger, U.S.A.*—A Report by the Citizens' Board of Inquiry Into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States (1968); Hurley, *Poverty and Mental Retardation—A Causal Relationship* (1969).

[39] In Shapiro v. Thompson, 394 U.S. 618 (1969), the Supreme Court held that discriminatory treatment, impinging upon the right to travel, can be constitutionally justified only if it 'promote[s] a *compelling* governmental interest." 394 U.S. at 634. Similarly here, the discriminatory deprivation of school lunches impinges upon children's educational opportunities. The right to education—although, like the right to travel, not explicitly protected by the Constitution—is so basic and important that an impingement of it "must be judged by the stricter standard of whether it [*i.e.*, the discrimination] promotes a *compelling* state interest." 394 U.S. at 638.

[40] 42 U.S.C. § 1758.

With its usual Philistine haste, the Agriculture Department promulgated "guidelines" for the enforcement of the free lunch legislation in October, 1968–22 years after the passage of the Act.[43] Although these guidelines were merely recommendations rather than mandatory regulations, they suggested that

> free or reduced price meals should be provided to children from any family certified as eligible for assistance under the Food Stamp Program or the Commodity Distribution Program and children from families participating in any of the various programs of public assistance such as Aid to Dependent Children, as well as families determined to be eligible under local standards related to local conditions.

In addition, children from households not receiving welfare or federal food program benefits, but "at comparable income levels," were also suggested as eligible recipients for free or reduced price lunches. Since the Department insisted that its standards were not requirements, the regulations were ineffective, and very few districts changed their free lunch policies.

This set the stage for Public Law 91-248, approved on May 14, 1970. *Inter alia*, the School Lunch Act amendments contained therein did the following: (1) established a mandatory floor for the provision of free lunches throughout the country; (2) indicated that the national floor—the "income poverty guidelines"—would have to be exceeded in areas with a higher cost of living; (3) defined the term "reduced price lunch" to denote meals that are provided for 20 cents or under; (4) required that the statutory free lunch provisions be applicable to schools receiving federal commodities, whether or not such schools receive cash School Lunch Program subsidies;[44] (5) required that certification for free lunches be accomplished through a system of self-declaration; and (6) required that proper notice be provided about the school district's free lunch policies. Several months thereafter, U.S.D.A. promulgated regulations to enforce the new School Lunch Act amendments.[45] These new amendments and regulations combine to provide substantial rights to needy children.

A. The Substantive Requirements

Pursuant to the new School Lunch Act amendments, the Secretary of Agriculture must prescribe "income poverty guidelines" that will serve as the national floor for the provision of free and reduced price lunches.[46] These "income poverty guidelines" are to be changed each fiscal year by the Secretary, and "[i]t is expected that [they] will be the same as established by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity."[47] Consequently, the "poverty levels" prescribed by H.E.W. and O.E.O. are the operative standards that the Secretary should use every year in developing the "income poverty guidelines."

On August 7, 1970, the Secretary promulgated this year's guidelines; they were applicable to the 48 continental United States, the District of Columbia, and the "outlying areas."[48] The standards are as follows:

---

[41] *See, e.g.*, complain and memoranda in Kennedy v. Detroit School Board, Civil Action No. 33367 (E.D. Mich.), Clearinghouse No. 2318A to E.

[42] For a general discussion of this morass, *see Their Daily Bread—A Study of the National School Lunch Program* (1968), pp. 13-32.

[43] *See* 33 Fed. Reg. 15674-15676 (1968).

[44] Until the enactment of Public Law 91-248, 'commodity only schools" were exempt from the free lunch provisions of the School Lunch Act; until the new amendments only schools that received cash subsidies had to provide free lunches. As a result, school districts throughout the country—including Los Angeles, San Diego, Kansas City, and numerous others—only accepted federal commodities, not subsidies, and refused to provide needy children with free or reduced price lunches.

[45] *See* 35 Fed. Reg. 14061-14068, to be codified in 7 C.F.R. §§ 210 *et seq.* and 245 *et seq.*

[46] 42 U.S.C. § 1758.

[47] Joint Senate-House Committee, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess., Report to the 1970 School Lunch Act Amendments 9 (April 29, 1970).

[48] *See* 35 Fed. Reg. 12620. The 'outlying areas" include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Only Hawaii and Alaska have different (and higher) guidelines than the national floor, as a result of their substantially increased cost of living.

Family size:	Annual income	Family size:	Annual income
1	$1, 920	6	4, 820
2	2, 520	7	5, 320
3	3, 120	8	5, 820
4	3, 720	Each additional family member	450
5	4, 270		

At the very least, therefore, any child from a family whose income is below the applicable family-size income levels *must* receive a free or reduced price lunch. Consequently, since a reduced price lunch means a meal served "at a reduced cost *not exceeding 20 cents per meal*,"[49] a child from a four-person household whose annual income is $3,720 or below *must* receive his or her lunch for 20 cents or less.

Congressional intent behind the free or reduced price lunch policy is now clear, no child is to be denied mid-day nutrition because of an inability to pay. The crux of this policy is most clearly stated in the Joint Senate-House Conference Report to the 1970 School Lunch Act amendments:

> While it is the intent of the managers that every child from an impoverished family shall be served meals either free or at reduced cost—not to exceed 20 cents per meal—it is also the intent that free lunches be provided for the poorest of the poor and under no circumstances shall those unable to pay be charged for their lunches. . . . It should be clear that, although the poverty guideline is the only mandatory national standard, children from a family meeting other criteria shall also be eligible for free or reduced price lunches. Joint Senate-House Committee, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess., Report to the 1970 School Lunch Act Amendments 9 (April 29, 1970).

This policy is most important for our urban centers and other areas with a high cost of living. Since the national "income poverty guidelines" are inadequate for these areas, higher standards must be prescribed for them. It is clear, therefore, that states and local school districts *may* increase the standards for providing free and reduced price meals;[50] moreover, if the Act's policy is not to be frustrated—*i.e.*, the intent that "under no circumstances shall those unable to pay be charged for their lunches"—it is clear that a district's standards *must* be increased if the "income poverty guidelines" inadequately reflect which children cannot pay for their meals.

The free lunch criteria adopted by a school board must be applicable to all schools in the district. They must be applicable to the elementary, junior high and senior high schools alike.[51] In addition, children whose family income exceeds the district's standards must be permitted to apply for free or reduced price lunches. If such children are unable to pay for their lunches, then they, too, must be provided with free mid-day meals.[52]

In some school districts the standards have already been changed pursuant to the new legislation and regulations, but quotas have been established limiting the number of free and reduced price lunches to be provided.[53] The implementation of a quota system is clearly contrary to the School Lunch Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder.[54] Such a system may be constitutionally deficient as well.

---

[49] 42 U.S.C. § 1758 (emphasis added).

[50] The pertinent part of the School Lunch Program regulations state:

> Any state agency, or FNSRO [Food and Nutrition Service Regional Office] where applicable, may require that school food authorities under its jurisdiction establish the maximum price of a reduced price lunch at a level below 20 cents or establish criteria for determining eligibility for free or reduced price lunches containing family size income levels above those in the income poverty guidelines prescribed by the Secretary. 7 C.F.R. § 245.11(a).

[51] 7 C.F.R. § 245.3(a).

[52] 7 C.F.R. §245.3(b).

[53] In Dallas, for example, like many other school districts in the State of Texas, the school board promulgated free lunch standards consistent with the "income poverty guidelines." Although the free lunch standards were far improved, few children received the benefit since a quota was placed on the distribution of free lunches.

[54] 42 U.S.C. § 1758; 7 C.F.R. §245.3(a).

In *Shaw v. Governing Board of Modesto City School District*, 310 F. Supp. 1282 (E.D. Cal., 1970)[55]—a case that raised issues very analogous to the quota situation—the plaintiffs challenged the school district's free lunch standards. The district court found that the school board's free lunch standards were established pursuant to its determination that only 400 free lunches should be provided per day. The ourt held that such a quota system is violative of the School Lunch Act:

> [T]he Board made no determination of which *children* were unable to pay; its determination was based on how much the *schools* could afford to pay. That was where the determination was faulty and unacceptable under the Act.[56] 310 F. Supp. at 1285.

Similarly, any quota on free lunches—even if established after the adoption of the "income poverty guidelines"—is violative of the School Lunch Act.

B. The Procedural Requirements.

Pursuant to the new School Lunch Act amendments and the regulations promulgated thereunder, poor children are provided with numerous procedural protections that they never had before. The most important of these new rights is the self-certification application procedure. The purpose of this procedure is to assure that needy children will be immediately certified for free lunches, in a manner that will be least compromising to their dignity. Although H.E.W. is testing similar certification systems for its public assistance programs, the School Lunch Program certification mechanism is unique because of its breadth.

Under the new procedures, indigent children need only submit an application, signed by a parent or guardian, to receive free lunches.[57] If the information contained on the application indicates that these children are eligible for free lunches—pursuant to the district's eligibility criteria—then they must immediately receive their free meal entitlements. Even if school officials believe that the application answers are false, they must provide free lunches to the children. The only recourse for the school district is to file for a fair hearing; until such a hearing culminates in a decision against the children, they must continue to receive free lunches.[58]

This, of course, does not mean that children who are ineligible for free lunches—pursuant to the district's income criteria—may not apply for free meals. For such children, however, the burden is shifted, and they must substantiate their inability to pay for school lunches. The children who, on the face of their application, qualify for reduced price lunches but cannot afford to pay anything, have the burden of showing that they are unable to pay for the reduced cost lunches.

The following hypothetical is illustrative of the numerous situations that will arise under these new procedures. School district X has promulgated a free or reduced price lunch schedule, for a family of four, that sets eligibility standards as follows: $0.00 to $4,000 annual income—children get lunch for free; $4,000 to $5,000 annual income—children get lunch for (reduced price of) 20 cents; over $5,000 annual income—children pay (full price of) 35 cents. These situations will, then, arise:

Situation No. 1: A parent of a four-person household signs a free lunch application indicating that the annual family income is $3,800. (The children in this family, according to the Act and regulations, are automatically eligible for free lunches as soon as the application is handed in; if the school officials don't want to provide free lunches for the children, they can ask for an appeal. In this appeal, *the officials must prove* that the family has a higher income than the $3,800 indicated on the application; until an adverse decision is handed down against the indigent family, the children must continue receiving free lunches.)

---

[55] 4 Clearinghouse Rev. 93 (June 1970, Clearinghouse No. 3533. Although the *Shaw* case was decided before the 1970 School Lunch Act amendments, the statutory provisions at issue therein are still in the amended Act.

[56] In another part of the opinion, the court said that "it is clear to me the statute mandates that the school authorities make a determination of which are unable to pay, not how many children the school can afford to feed." 310 F. Supp. at 1285.

[57] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1758.

[58] The applicable regulatory provision is found at 7 C.F.R. § 245.6, subsection (b) thereof, in its relevant part states:

> When the information furnished by a family in its application indicates that the family meets the eligibility standards for either a free or reduced price lunch, the children from such a family shall be provided the free or reduced price lunch to which such information indicates they are entitled. . . . If the school food authority subsequently wishes to challenge the correctness of the information contained in an application, it shall do so under the hearing procedure established under § 245.7 of this part. During the pendency of any such challenge, the children of the family shall continue to receive the free or reduced priced lunch to which they are entitled based on the information contained in the application.

Situation No. 2: A parent of a four-person household signs a free lunch application indicating that the annual family income is $4,400. (The children in this family, according to the Act and regulations, are automatically eligible for reduced price lunches of 20 cents per lunch as soon as the application is handed in; if the school officials don't want to provide reduced price lunches for the children, they can ask for an appeal. Once again, the officials must prove that the family has a higher income than the $4,400 indicated on the application; until a decision is made against the indigent family, the children must continue receiving reduced price lunches.)

Situation No. 3: A parent of a four-person household signs a free lunch application indicating that the family income is $4,400. The parent indicates, however, that the children are unable to pay 20 cents per lunch. (*At the very least,* the children in this family, according to the Act and regulations, are automatically eligible for reduced price lunches at 20 cents per lunch as soon as the application is handed in; the indigent parent has the right to appeal such a determination, showing that the family is unable to pay for the 20 cent lunches. If the parent can adduce such evidence, the children have the right to free school lunches.)

Situation No. 4: A parent of a four-person household signs a free lunch application indicating that the family income is $5,200. The parent indicates, however, that the children are unable to pay for their school lunches. (This family, *at the very least,* has the right to a fair hearing to prove its inability to pay for the children's lunches. If the parent can adduce such evidence, the children are entitled to reduced price lunches; if the parent also shows that the family cannot afford the 20 cent lunches, then the children must get their lunches for free.)

In order to make sure that impoverished families can properly utilize the new self-certification procedure, applications must be "clear and simple in design and the information requested thereon shall be limited to that required to demonstrate that the family does, or does not, meet the criteria in the eligibility standards for free or reduced price lunches, respectively, issued by the school food authority."[59] The information requested on the application, therefore, must be limited to: (1) the children's names and their schools; (2) the number of people residing in the children's household; and (3) the household's total income. No other questions should be on the application. Space, however, should be left on the application so that parents—of households *whose income exceeds the district's free lunch standards*—may demonstrate that their children cannot pay for school lunches. Moreover, the application—which is to be signed by an adult member of the family—"shall include a statement immediately above the space for signature that the person signing the application certifies that all the information furnished in the application is true and correct to the best of his knowledge or belief."[60]

Since the new substantive and procedural rights would be of little effect if parents did not know of their rights, the regulations carefully set forth the requirements for notifying parents of School Lunch Program policies. At the beginning of each school year, a notice must be sent by mail, or with the children, to parents that explains the district's free lunch policies.[61] At least three things must be contained in these notices: (1) the eligibility criteria for free and reduced price lunches; (2) a description of the free lunch application procedures; (3) a description of how a family can appeal adverse decisions on free lunch eligibility, as well as the family's rights under these hearing procedures.[62] A copy of the free lunch application form must accompany the parents' notices.[63]

---

[59] 7 C.F.R. § 245.6(a).

[60] *Id.*

[61] 7 C.F.R. § 245.5(a).

[62] *Id.* In addition, [a] public release, containing the same information supplied to the parents, shall be made available to the informational media in the area from which the school draws its attendance, on or about the beginning of each school year." 7 C.F.R. § 245.5(b). This information must also be made "available upon request to any interested party" 7 C.F.R. § 245.5(c).

[63] *Id.*

The final change in the new regulations deals with children's rights at free lunch fair hearings. Although many of the regulatory rights are arguably, at least, covered by due process requirements, the comprehensiveness of the hearing rights is significant. Under the regulations, the hearing procedure must provide:

> (1) A simple, publicly-announced method for a family to make an oral or written request for a hearing;
>
> (2) An opportunity for the family to be assisted or represented by an attorney or other person in presenting its appeal;
>
> (3) An opportunity to examine, prior to and during the hearing, the documents and record presented to support the decision under appeal;
>
> (4) That the hearing shall be held with reasonable promptness and convenience to the family and that adequate notice shall be given to the family as to the time and place of the hearing;
>
> (5) An opportunity for the family to present oral or documentary evidence and arguments supporting its position without undue interference;
>
> (6) An opportunity for the family to question or refute any testimony or other evidence and to confront and cross-examine any adverse witnesses;
>
> (7) That the hearing shall be conducted and the decision made by a hearing official who did not participate in making the decision under appeal;
>
> (8) That the decision of the hearing official shall be based on the oral and documentary evidence presented at the hearing and made a part of the hearing record;
>
> (9) That the family and any designated representative shall be notified in writing of the decision of the hearing official;
>
> (10) That a written record shall be prepared with respect to each hearing, which shall include the decision under appeal, any documentary evidence and summary of any oral testimony presented at the hearing, the decision of the hearing official, including the reasons therefor, and a copy of the notification to the family of the decision of the hearing official; and
>
> (11) That such written record of each hearing shall be preserved for a period of three years and shall be available for examination by the family or its representative at any reasonable time and place during such period.[64]

III. DISCRIMINATION AGAINST FREE LUNCH RECIEPIENTS

Poor children throughout the country frequently refuse to pick up their free mid-day meals because of discriminatory treatment perpetrated against free lunch recipients. In some school districts, children are forced to work for their "free" meals. In other districts, free lunch recipients are forced to use a separate lunchroom, go through a separate serving line, enter the lunchroom through a different entrance, eat lunch at a different time than paying children, use a different medium of exchange in the lunchroom than paying children use, and/or eat a different meal than paying children. The short of it is that impoverished children are singled out for humiliating treatment that frequently inhibits them from obtaining their free lunch entitlements.[65]

Under the School Lunch Act, however, such discriminatory treatment is clearly illegal. In its relevant part, the Act states:

> No physical segretation of or other discrimination against any child shall be made by the school because of his inability to pay, nor shall there be any overt identification of any such child by special tokens or tickets, announced or published lists of names.[66]

In addition, the regulations define the term "free lunch" as a "lunch for which neither the child nor any member of his family pays or is required to work in the school or in the school's lunch program."[67] Moreover, all of the types of discrimination enumerated above are explicitly prohibited in the regulations.[68]

The obvious intent behind the federal statute and regulations is to assure that indigent children will not be humiliated before their more affluent classmates when they receive their free lunch entitlements. Since the singling out of indigent children as being poor frequently embarasses them, no overt identification of free lunch recipients is permitted. Therefore, the main problem for school administrators is to devise a method of collecting money for paying children so that no one (except those administrators) knows who is paying for lunches and who is getting lunches for free.

---

[64] 7 C.F.R. § 245.7(a).

[65] For a description of the various types of discrimination perpetrated against free lunch recipients, *see Their Daily Bread, supra* note 42, at 33-36.

[66] 42 U.S.C § 1758.

[67] 7 C.F.R. § 210.2(h-1). Similarly, *see* 7 C.F.R. § 210.2(n-1), where the term "reduced price lunch" is defined as "a lunch which meets all of the following criteria: (1) the price shall be less than the full price of the lunch; (2) the price shall be 20 cents or lower; and (3) neither the child nor any member of his family shall be required to supply an equivalent value in work for the school or the school lunch program.

[68] *See* 7 C.F.R. § 245.8.

Several methods for money collection have been suggested by conscientious School Lunch Program administrators. The following are some of the better suggestions:

Method No. 1: All students go to a designated area (*e.g.*, school office, cafeteria, manager's office, pay station) at varying times during the day. At such times those who pay the full price or reduced price do so and are issued a numbered ticket or token. Those approved for free meals are given a numbered ticket or token. All tickets or tokens are identical, except for code numbers used for accounting purposes known only to authorized school personnel.

Method No. 2: All students who pay the full or reduced price purchase weekly tickets at a designated area at varying times during the day. The school office mails weekly tickets to the families of those children who are eligible to receive free lunches. All tickets are identical, except for code numbers used for accounting purposes known only to authorized school personnel.

Method No. 3: The homeroom teacher has each child come up to her desk individually and state whether he is going to eat the school lunch that day. (This, of course, can be done on a weekly basis as well.) The teacher will have a list of which children pay full price, reduced price, or receive free lunches. All payments are contained in envelopes, and each child receiving free lunches submits an empty envelope. Tickets or tokens are to be given out at this time. All tickets or tokens are identical, except for code numbers used for accounting purposes known only to authorized school personnel.

Method No. 4: In schools with relatively few needy children, an all-cash system can be used in the lunchroom. Needy students are issued the money required to purchase their lunches on a daily basis. The monitoring of the expenditure of such funds is to be done in such a manner that the needy pupil does not suffer embarrassment.

IV. CONCLUSION

One important point must be made in conclusion. Although litigation is a potent weapon in the effort to remedy School Lunch Program problems, other avenues of redress should usually be explored first. Many lawyers and community organizers have found that School Lunch Program problems serve as a good rallying point for building stronger poor peoples' organizations. The National Welfare Rights Organization, as an example, has developed numerous free lunch campaigns throughout the country. In so doing, they have not only remedied local School Lunch Program problems quickly, but they have also built stronger organizations that could then deal more effectively with problems related to housing, health, education and adequate income. Thus, it is imperative that efforts to improve the School Lunch Program be coordinated so that they add—rather than detract or remain irrelevant—to local organizing efforts. Only then can School Lunch Program campaigns play an integral role in our fight for adequate income and human dignity.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

Civil Action No. 33367

CHERYL KENNEDY, ET AL, PLAINTIFFS, V. THE DETROIT BOARD OF EDUCATION, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Affidavit of Dr. T. N. Evans

I, Dr. T. N. EVANS, hereby depose and say as follows:

1. I am Professor and Chairman of the Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics at Wayne State University School of Medicine and Department Chairman of Gynecology and Obstetrics at Hutzel Hospital.

2. For the last 3 years, I have assisted in a study supported by a grant from the Seyforth Foundation to investigate the relationship between maternal

protein intake, blood levels of amino acids and infant birth weight, length, brain size, and mentation.

3. This is the first and only statistically reliable study conducted utilizing objective measurements to relate directly prenatal nutrition to brain size and mentation. Previous studies were based on dietary histories that proved impossible to control and assess.

4. All patients selected for study were Negro residents of Detroit living in the inner city and who received prenatal care and were delivered at Hutzel Hospital. Many were on public assistance.

5. The study established that prenatal nutrition is directly related to brain size and volume determined within the first 48 hours of neonatal life and mentation determined at eight months of age. The children of mothers with lower protein intake (less than 50 gm. per day) had a smaller brain size at birth than did children of mothers with higher protein intake (greater than 70 gm. per day).

6. The study pinpointed the relationship between inadequate nutrition, brain size, and intellectual potential and growth. The mothers we examined needed additional protein during pregnancy. However, in most cases, this additional nutrition during pregnancy would not provide the level of nutrition necessary to assure an adequate brain size and mentation for their children. Thus, it is necessary to provide adequate nutrition throughout the growth and development of those from the inner-city so that their children will not start from the same deficiencies in nutrition as found in the study. An adequate school lunch program will help provide the necessary nutrition now lacking in the inner-city children. Given the consumption patterns, lack of food availability, and inadequate finances of inner-city families, many children will not receive adequate nutrition. Providing school lunches may be the only balanced and stable meal they receive. The availability of school lunches to all children, particularly those whose incomes are low, is an essential ingredient of any program to aid the nutritional and educational growth of inner-city children and to assure that additional protein intake during the pregnancy of mothers will help alleviate small brain size and its consequences.

T. N. EVANS, M.D.

[From Howard W. Briggs]

COST OF FREE LUNCHES TO INDIGENT STUDENTS

The Board reimburses the Food Service Department for the cost of meals served to indigent students. The following statement shows for selected years the cost and number of meals served to these students:

Year	Number of meals	Amount
1950–51	938,623	$230,011.35
1955–56	1,323,664	405,164.32
1960–61	1,888,297	732,619.64
1961–62	1,007,063	365,415.11
1962–63	1,022,846	370,042.16
1963–64	125,451	48,702.14
1964–65	215,369	83,487.83
1965–66	377,990	134,055.61
1966–67	762,692	274,588.37
1967–68	1,189,114	486,604.54
1968–69	1,409,810	407,980.90

UPPER PENINSULA LEGAL SERVICES, INC.,
Marquette, Mich., May 13, 1971.

Re School Lunch Programs

Mr. ALAN HOUSEMAN,
Michigan Legal Services Assistance Program,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR AL: Here is some hastily gathered documentation on the status of the school lunch programs in the Upper Peninsula, which is far from complete.

GOGEBIC-ONTONAGON COUNTIES

School district	Lunch program	Number of pupils
Wakefield	No	500
City of Bessemer	Yes; buys from parochial school—probably not in all buildings.	500
Township of Bessemer (Ramsay)	Yes	250
Marenisco	No	200
Bergland	No	300
Ironwood	To start in the fall of 1971	1,700
Watersmeet	No	[1] 160
Ontonagon	Yes	800
White Pine	Yes	350
Bruces Crossing-Ewen	Yes	800

[1] Mostly Indians.

MENOMINEE-DELTA-SCHOOLCRAFT COUNTIES

I am informed by the head start director in these counties that all school districts presently offer a hot lunch program, with the free or reduced price lunch being based upon recommended income guidelines under "Scale B", the higher income recommended. She concludes that they "presently enjoy a fine cooperative attitude with the public schools and the Intermediate School District." (I haven't had an opportunity to check my skepticism about this statement.)

CHIPPEWA-LUCE-MACKINAC COUNTIES

I am informed that only the St. Ignace School District lacks the hot lunch program, but that it is scheduled to open in the Fall of 1971. I do not know whether all the buildings within the school districts have the program. At least one school district within these counties (Brimley) is sufficiently poor so that the school district receives 100% reimbursement on the free or reduced price of lunches.

BARAGA-HOUGHTON-KEWEENAW COUNTIES

See attached sheet.

ALGER-MARQUETTE COUNTIES

School district	Lunch program	Number of pupils
Munising	Yes	1,677
AuTrain	Yes	62
Burt	Yes	116
Limestone	Yes	49
Mathias	Yes	193
Rock River	Yes	371
Marquette	Only high school and junior high school, not elementary schools.	4,873
Marquette Township	No	245
Chocolay Township	No	624
Ishpeming	Yes	2,196
Ishpeming Township	Yes	405
Negaunee	Yes	1,921
Republic	Yes	503
Champion, etc	Yes	320
Ely	Yes	165
Forsyth Township	Yes	3,767
National Mine	Yes	344
Powell	Yes (no State aid)	82
Sands	No	23
Wells	Yes	46

IRON-DICKINSON COUNTIES

I am informed that all school districts and all the schools within those districts have some form of lunch program, although two high schools are using the Stewart sandwich catering program, and two elementary schools are buying their lunches from a catholic school catering service. Approximately 10,000 students are servied in these two counties.

I hope this is helpful and apologize for both the rough approximations and the tardiness in which it has been sent. You might tell Gabe that we filed our NMU dormitory complaint in Federal court today, which has taken up some of my time this week.

If I can be of further assistance in connection with your testimony, give me a call.

Very truly yours,

William S. Easton,
Attorney at Law.

FROM JAMES L. BOROUGH

Michigan Department of Education

School Food Services Section

The following table is an up-to-date resume of school lunch transactions in Michigan as compared to 1969–70.

It does not represent the end, but we feel that it does represent progress. State funds are needed, not only to assist in the provision of free or reduced price lunches to needy children, but to help keep the parent program financially able to continue.

HB–4103 would provide $5.5 million and HB–4106 would provide $10 million for these purposes.

APPENDIX A

	1969–70	1970–71
Total funds available [1]	$10,500,000	$19,200,000
Number of school districts	673	626
Number of districts participating	538	543
Number of schools	3,722	3,671
Number of schools participating	2,341	2,538
	About 20%	
Average daily participation	559,179	618 422
Average daily served to needy	67,431	118,362
Total lunches served (March)	9,510,024	12,311,608
Total lunches served free or reduced price (March)	1,630,286	2,485,618

[1] Includes special milk program, equipment purchase program, school breakfast program, as well as school lunch program funds. 100 percent Federal.

	1970–71 allotments	1971–72 recommendations
NSLP Federal funds:		
Sec. 4	$5,185,552	$10,000,000
Sec. 11	4,781,666	17,500,000
CF sec. 32	3,611,769	
CNA funds	13,578,987	27,500,000
Breakfasts	261,895	750,000
Equipment purchases	755,247	[1] 3,000,000
Administration	66,944	100,000
Special milk funds	4,614,274	----------
Total funds available	19,277,347	31,350,000

[1] Including construction.

APPENDIX B

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES SECTION, SCHOOL MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIVISION, LANSING, MICH. 48902

FINAL ALLOTMENT SCHEDULE—1969-70 FUNDING

	Primary	1st supplement	2d supplement	Total	Used	Balance to be used
Sec. 4	$3,861,887			$3,861,887	$3,861,887	$0
Sec. 11	327,656			327,656	327,656	0
Breakfast	215,322			215,322	215,322	0
Equipment	229,818	$7,890	$9,607	247,315	247,315	0
Sec. 32[1]	1,762,818	291,609	(31,768)	2,022,659	2,022,659	0
Administration	51,748			51,748	36,528	15,220
Totals	6,449,249	299,499	(22,161)	6,726,587	6,711,367	15,220

[1] Section 32 funds were used to supplement Sec. 11, Breakfast and Equipment programs as well as for reimbursement lunches served to needy children direct from sec. 32 accounts (the latter we called "operating"):

Operating	$310,797.00
Sec. 11 schools	131,144.00
Combined 11 and 4 and 32 schools	1,331,153.00
Breakfasts	44,001.00
Equipment	205,564.00
Total	2,022,659.00

APPENDIX C

PROGRESS REPORT

	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71
National School Lunch Program					
Sec. 4:					
Districts	547	542	540	538	543
Schools	2,162	2,200	2,295	2,341	2,538
Average daily participation	529,718	536,002	583,421	559,179	618,422
Funds	$3,496,417	$3,594,845	$3,844,771	$3,861,887	$5,185,522
Sec. 11:					
Districts	18	19	109	74	539
Schools	31	38	543	586	2,523
Average daily participation	6,298	7,271	36,644	91,634	124,391
Funds	[1] $19,845	[1] $42,161	[2] $122,202	$327,656	$4,781,666
Child Nutrition Act					
Special Milk Program:					
Districts	743	698	601	616	614
Schools	3,782	4,063	3,417	3,712	3,672
Average daily participation	750,000	765,000	767,821	727,813	748,572
Funds	$4,434,682	$4,673,122	$4,480,000	$4,565,090	$4,614,274
Breakfasts:					
Districts	6	7	18	34	37
Schools	11	32	86	113	161
Average daily participation	1,577	2,423	9,804	11,559	14,744
Funds	[3] $25,018	$24,000	[2] $66,260	$215,322	$261,895
Nonfood:					
Districts	4	4	12	32	41
Schools	9	26	42	129	292
Average daily participation	?	?	?	59,176	161,422
Funds	$17,755	$17,004	[2] $17,795	[4] $247,315	$755,247
Sec. 32: Appropriated in 1968-69 for use in sec. 11, school breakfasts and nonfood assistance. Included in figures shown above			$1,093,636	$2,022,659	$3,611,769
State administrative funds	0	0	$22,895	$51,748	$66,944

[1] Supplemented with sec. 4 funds.
[2] Plus sec. 32.
[3] Not entirely used.
[4] CNA.

FROM PHILLIP RUNKEL

To: Mr. Phillip Runkel
From: Mr. Dave Lancashire

STATISTICS RELEVANT TO THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM IN THE GRAND RAPIDS PUBLIC SCHOOLS AT THIS POINT IN TIME

	Number	Percent
Elementary schools—number, 52:		
Total enrollment	[1] 15, 384	
Schools with NSLP, 18:		
Enrollment of these schools	5, 424	
Students qualified for free lunch in these schools [2]	2, 834	52. 2
Students served free lunch in these schools [3]	2, 459	45. 3
Special education schools (separate)—number, 4:		
Total enrollment	715	
Schools with hot lunch program, 4:		
Students qualified for free lunch [2]	194	27. 1
Students served free lunch [3]	176	24. 6
Junior high and middle schools—number, 9:		
Total enrollment	7, 129	
Schools with hot lunch program, 9:		
Students qualified for free lunch [2]	1, 013	14. 2
Students served free lunch [3]	646	9. 1
Senior high schools—number, 4:		
Total enrollment	6, 685	
Schools with hot lunch program, 4:		
Students qualified for free lunch [2]	295	4. 4
Students served free lunch [3]	197	2. 9
Recap; whole district—number, 69:		
Total enrollment	29, 913	
Schools with hot lunch program, 35:		
Students qualified for free meals [2]	4, 336	14. 5
Students served free meals [3]	3, 478	11. 6

[1] Less K and Federal programs.
[2] Actual applications on file.
[3] Average daily participation of qualified students.

FROM E. JAMES KITSON

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
November 12, 1970.

To: Jack Randall.
From: James L. Borough.
Subject: School lunch reimbursement rates.

Agr. No	33–020.
Dist	Lansing.
From	.04 & .25.
To	.05 & .30.

This will be effective with the October claim.

APRIL 22, 1971.

MR. JAMES BOROUGH,
School Food Services Section,
Department of Education,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR MR. BOROUGH: During the past school year a financial burden has developed in the Lansing School District Food Service Department. This burden has grown due to the school district being completely compatible with the philosophy of the National School Lunch Act, regarding free and reduced price meals. In September prior to the General Motors strike we were serving 8.3% free or reduced price meals. After the strike was under way and our newly revised policy statement made public, the percent increased to 15.9% and 15.8% respectively for November and December. With the strikers returning to work in January we expected a drop in participation. However, January increased to 16.8%, February to 18.8% or 18,366 meals for the month.

Based on the above information, a ten percent (10%) increase has been realized during this school year. This to me, would indicate an objective review of the Lansing reimbursement rates is in order at this time. Further, percentages are not always indicative of the over-all picture when we consider the basic raw numbers we are dealing with in the secondary schools here, as compared to other school district's total enrollment.

Without a total commitment for food service to all buildings at this crucial tax millage time, I realize your office would find it most difficult to approve a sixty cent (60¢) reimbursement rate. However, if the food service program becomes an additional liability to the district, I feel the program is in jeopardy.

So—please consider this letter as my official request for a fair, consistent, objective reimbursement rate review for the Lansing school district.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

E. JAMES KITSON,
Director of Food Services.

MEMORANDUM—MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

APRIL 23, 1971.

To: Jack Randall.
From: James L. Borough.
Subject: School Lunch Reimbursement Rates.

Agr. No., 33–020; Lansing Public School District; From .05 & .30, to .07 & .30.

Increase in reimbursement effective April 1, 1971.

ITEM 2. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

[From the Lansing State Journal, Mar. 13, 1971]

SCHOOL HOT LUNCH PROGRAM POSTPONED

(By Judith Brown)

An experimental hot lunch program for a selected group of elementary schools definitely will not be initiated this semester by the Lansing Board of Education, but may be implemented next fall.

That decision was announced by school officials Friday following a special board session during which a majority of members voted to cancel a lunch program proposed for this semester since there was not sufficient time to conduct a pilot project.

The board did state, however, that an experimental lunch program may be in operation next September at Cedar, Grand River, High Street, Michigan Avenue and Oak Park elementary schools. If an experimental program is implemented next fall at these schools, it would be modeled after one being conducted in the Grand Rapids public schools where the meals are prepared by a private firm and supplied to the buildings.

Such a program would be largely self-supporting through the use of federal subsidies and the prices to be charged for the meals. Those children from families who meet specified federal income requirements would be supplied lunches on a free or reduced price basis. The lunch project, if implemented, would be voluntary with students being given the option of eating at school or going home for lunch.

The supervision costs involved in such a pilot program would be kept to a minimum, school officials said, and would probably be paid for with local tax funds.

OPPOSITION VOICED

Should the school board decide to embark on an experimental lunch program next fall at the elementary level, it would be carefully evaluated before any decision was made to expand it further to other schools.

The board's decision against implementing a lunch project this semester came in the wake of opposition voiced against it by some parents and taxpayers in the school district. Much of that opposition was based on the contention that the proposed lunch program was a waste of tax money. Others expressed disagreement with the proposal since it would have provided free or low-cost meals to children from low-income families, shortened the current lunch periods and possibly have restricted the use of school multi-purpose rooms for regular educational programs.

An experimental elementary lunch program has been under consideration by the school board since last fall when a committee of elementary principals began developing plans for it in cooperation with Model Cities officials and teacher union representatives.

The need for such a program was prompted by a 1970 federal law which requires all school districts receiving federal lunch subsidies to provide free or reduced price meals to all needy students. Although that law does not specify when this must be accomplished, it does state that federal lunch monies would be withdrawn from those districts failing to devise plans for such programs.

$231,000 SUBSIDIES

Last year, the Lansing School District received more than $231,000 in surplus commodities and federal lunch subsidies.

The proposal under consideration by the school board for the past several weeks called for hot lunches to be served later this semester at the five elementary schools mentioned above. These meals would have been provided free or at a reduced price for children from low-income homes, while all others wishing to participate would have paid about 35 cents per lunch.

The proposed program would have cost more than $123,000 this semester with only about $2,000 coming from the local district's budget. The remaining amount would have been financed with federal grants and Model Cities funds to be used for the purchase of equipment and hiring of lunchroom supervisors.

[From the Lansing State Journal, May 25, 1971]

PORTER URGES SCHOOL MEALS

(By Marcia Van Ness)

Youngsters must be healthy and well-nourished in order to learn—and, if necessary, schools must help to provide food—a U.S. Senate select committee heard here today.

Representing the congressional panel was U.S. Sen. Philip A. Hart, D-Mich. Hart will be in Michigan through Wednesday receiving testimony for the U.S. Senate select committee on nutrition and human needs.

Appearing first at today's hearing in the Capitol Complex was Dr. John W. Porter, state superintendent of public instruction, who outlined the problem.

"There ought not to be one hungry child in this state or in this nation," Porter said.

"A hungry child cannot concentrate on his studies, cannot attack the day's lesson with desire and enthusiasm, and faces his work with attention that lags and waivers."

Porter said Michigan's school lunch program should be expanded to respond to diet deficiencies in communities where the need is apparent.

"Breakfast and lunch service should not necessarily be provided just for the sake of saying such a program is in operation," Porter continued. "But it is highly probable that some type of breakfast and hot lunch program should be available in some affluent areas for those few youngsters who need nourishment."

STATE NOT HELPING

Porter told Hart the state will receive almost $20 million for school lunch and milk programs from the federal government this year.

"Michigan's Legislature has yet to appropriate one dime for this purpose, other than $75,000 in the State Department of Education budget for administration," Porter noted.

"We are seeking $10 million for next year and we hope the Legislature will focus on this problem."

GOALS

Porter listed three possible goals for Michigan:

—Every youngster attending public schools should have the opportunity for a nutritious lunch, particularly those who are poor and need it.

—Breakfast should be offered, too, for economically disadvantaged children.

—"I believe we should begin to consider not only providing breakfast and lunch, but also supper for those children who have no other way of obtaining such a meal."

Porter said he felt the cost of school lunches should be limited to not more than 25 cents as opposed to the average 33 to 40 cents now being charged.

[From the Detroit News, May 26, 1971]

HART SAYS STATE IS LAGGING ON SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

(By Al Sandner)

LANSING—Senator Philip A. Hart said yesterday that Michigan is one of the wealthiest states in the nation, yet it is feeding less than half of the poor children who could qualify for school lunches.

The Michigan Democrat opened a two-day hearing of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition here with testimony from Dr. John W. Porter, state superintendent of public instruction, and other state and school officials.

The hearing continued today in Detroit at the Veterans Memorial Building.

Only three other states—Rhode Island, Pennsylvania and Oregon—"are reaching a lower percentage of needy children under the national school lunch act of 1970, intended to implement President Nixon's pledge of a free or reduced-price meal to every poor child in the nation," Hart said.

Michigan is eligible for $40 million in federal funds this year, Hart said. Yet it is using only about $19 million.

The state itself has not appropriated any money for lunch programs except for $75,000 in Department of Education funds for administration, Porter said.

Although the decision as to whether a school district has a lunch program is a local one, Porter called for new state goals:

"First, I believe that every youngster attending public school should have the opportunity for a nutritious lunch.

"Second, I believe we can and should move more vigorously toward providing breakfast for those youngsters who are economically disadvantaged.

"Third, I believe we should begin to consider not only providing breakfast and lunch, but also supper for those children who have no other way of obtaining such a meal.

"A hungry child cannot concentrate on his studies. He cannot attack the day's lessons with desire and enthusiasm. A hungry child's attention lags and wavers. A hungry child too often can feel only the nagging pangs of hunger."

Porter said lunch costs—which now average 33 cents in elementary schools and just over 40 in secondary schools—"in far too many cases . . . seem too much for many families.

"School lunches at any level should be no more than 25 cents to those who can afford to pay," he added.

James L. Borough, supervisor of state school food services, said two million schoolchildren are poor enough to be eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch programs—a figure that was disputed by some committee aides.

The state tried vainly through the early 1960's to get adequate federal funding for school lunch programs, Borough said. "And now that adequate funding is nearly possible, it is difficult to swing into gear at the drop of a hat. Perhaps we are not moving ahead fast enough, but within the last two or three months much progress has been made."

The number of needy children served climbed from 20,000 in 1968–69 to 120,000 a day now, he said. Detroit has extended its program "from secondary schools and a few elementary schools to all poverty-area schools except two," he said.

"School lunches are now being served in all but 60 of Detroit's 315 schools," he added.

There are two types of lunch programs: Those paid for by the students, with a modest federal subsidy. And the free or reduced-price lunches which are substantially subsidized by Washington.

The whole lunch program is being complicated by general school finance problems, Borough said, adding:

"At the same time that many boards of education are faced with the possibility of canceling teachers' contracts, they must also determine whether picking up food service deficits are justifiable."

The ideal, he said, would be to provide free lunches to all regardless of need, but the $175 million cost in Michigan alone bars this avenue as unrealistic.

Alan W. Houseman, director of Michigan Legal Services in Detroit, praised Porter for being aggressive in promoting the lunch program but criticized Michigan for "spending not one cent of state funds . . . in one of the richest states in the nation.

"We must realize that you can't separate good nutrition from education. It stands above athletic programs and even above some of the cultural programs in our educational system."

[From the Detroit Free Press, May 26, 1971]

LEGISLATURE BLAMED FOR LAG IN SCHOOL LUNCH PLAN

(By William Grant)

LANSING—A big share of the blame for Michigan's poor showing in school lunch programs was placed on the state Legislature Tuesday.

"The Legislature hasn't appropriated a dime for this purpose," state Superintendent of Public Instruction John Porter told a hearing by the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition.

Michigan's Sen. Philip Hart, who is conducting the two-days of hearings on school lunch programs, noted that only three states—Rhode Island, Pennsylvania and Oregon—serve a smaller percentage of needy youngsters than Michigan.

"When Illinois has more defense contracts than Michigan," Hart said, "I don't believe I should necessarily demand that Michigan get an equal amount. But when Illinois gets more federal money to serve a greater percentage of it needy youngsters, I think we in Michigan should be in that kind of competition."

James Borough, supervisor of food services for the state Department of Education, noted that Illinois not only appropriates some of its own money for school lunch programs, but also has a state law requiring every school system to feed every needy student.

"Maybe the leadership has been lacking," Hart said, "since we haven't been able to sell our own Legislature on making that kind of moral commitment."

Porter noted that just under $20 million is provided Michigan by the federal government for school lunches, and that all the state has contributed in the past has been the $75,000 the state education department spends administering the program.

Federal law will require the state to put up at least $900,000 as its share of the school lunch program in the coming school year. But Porter has asked the Legislature to spend $10 million in state funds so the program can be expanded.

State officials told the committee that between one-third and one-half of the state's estimated 300,000 needy school children are now receiving a free lunch.

Most of the others fail to receive a free lunch because many schools in the state have no lunch program at all. Porter, Borough and Alan W. Houseman, director of Michigan Legal Services, all asked the federal government to make money available to build lunchroom facilities in those schools where no program is offered.

Houseman argued that other federal money for education "was wasted" unless children have the proper food and are therefore physically able to learn.

"It is unfortunate that the schools have to be burdened with school lunch programs," said Houseman, who has filed suits in Detroit and other Michigan school systems seeking broader lunch programs. "But the reality is that we can't separate this from education."

There still is resistence from some educators and parents to schools offering food services. Mrs. Richard Parsaca, chairman of the School Lunch Committee of Kent County, reported that one school principal warned her that offering a lunch program was leaning toward "those Communist countries where institutions play a large part in bringing up a child."

And Mrs. Gilbert Smith, a Lansing parent, explained why she opposes adding a lunch program at her children's school. "We strongly believe the responsibility for feeding children rests with the parents of these children. The school's function is to educate children. Hungry children in this country are not needy children, but neglected children."

The hearing will continue Wednesday at the Veterans Memorial in Detroit.

Appendix 2

ITEMS PERTINENT TO THE DETROIT HEARING

ITEM 1. MATERIAL SUPPLIED BY THE WITNESSES

FROM HOWARD W. BRIGGS

Detroit Public Schools,
Division of Business Affairs, Department of Food Service,
Detroit, Mich., May 28, 1971.

Hon. Senator Philip A. Hart,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Re Michigan Hearings Senate Select Committee Nutrition and Human Needs.

Dear Senator Hart: As I reviewed the written testimony of the hearings of May 25 and 26 it occurred to me that Mrs. Earlene Taylor* had submitted "for the record" a copy of an application for Free Lunches used in the Detroit Public Schools. In her written statement, Mrs. Taylor referred to this application as a "Family Data Sheet," which was the title of an application no longer used. On January 1, 1971, in compliance with new regulations issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a new application form, as well as new guidelines were adopted and issued by the Board of Education of the City of Detroit.

For the record, I am enclosing a copy of the current application, Form 34 dated (12–70), copy of the letter that was sent home to the parents that contained the new guidelines for free and reduced price lunches, also a copy of the new guidelines that become effective April 1, 1971.

Again, I would like to express our appreciation for your interest and support of the school feeding programs in Michigan. The hearings have been helpful in assisting us in focusing our attention to the problems at hand and in providing some insight towards the solutions.

Sincerely,

Howard W. Briggs.

---

*See pp. 1442, 1443.

REQUEST FOR SCHOOL LUNCH

TO THE PRINCIPAL______________________________________**SCHOOL**

I want my children listed below to remain at school for lunch

DAILY ☐ **OCCASIONALLY** ☐

Name(s) of Pupil(s)____

________________ ________________ ________________ ________________

Parents or guardians who feel that their children are eligible for a "reduced price" or free lunch should complete the following information:

FAMILY INCOME:	**WEEKLY INCOME**
Father:	**$**________
Mother	**$**________
Guardian	**$**________
TOTAL	**$**________

FAMILY SIZE:

No. of Adult Members . . . . ________

No. of Dependent Children . . . . ________

Total . . . . ________

COMMENTS:____

____

____

____

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE THE STATEMENTS AND INFORMATION PROVIDED ON THIS APPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT.

Signed________________________________

Address_______________________________

Date________________ **Telephone No.**________________________

If your children attend separate schools, you must complete an application for each school.

Form 34 (12-70, D) **DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Dear parents, The majority of Detroit Public Schools have a lunch program in which your children may participate. In most schools a hot lunch is provided. However, recently we have introduced a cold lunch program in schools where facilities would not permit the operation of a hot lunch program. Lunch programs will be provided in schools without a program as funds permit.

The regular low selling price of the lunch to students depends on the type of school and type of lunch program offered. In high schools, students are charged 45¢; in junior high schools, 40¢; and in elementary schools, 30¢ for a hot lunch and 20¢ for an "Astro-Pack" or cold lunch.

Since some families may find it difficult to pay the full price for their children's lunch, we provide lunches at a reduced price or free to students who are unable to pay the full price. Children from families whose yearly incomes are *at or below* those listed in the following scales are eligible to receive lunches at a reduced price or free.

	Yearly income scale for reduced price lunches	Yearly income scale for free lunches
Total family size:		
1	$2,075	$875
2	2,760	1,560
3	3,375	2,175
4	4,025	2,825
5	4,620	3,420
6	5,215	4,015
7	5,750	4,550
8	6,300	5,100
For additional family members add	485	485

We may also take into account unusual financial hardships. If you have any questions, you should discuss these matters with your school principal.

Reduced price lunches sell for 20¢ in senior and junior high schools and for 15¢ in elementary schools with the hot lunch program, or 10¢ in schools offering the "Astro-Pack" lunch.

Attached is an application blank which you may use if you feel your children are qualified for a reduced price or free lunch. Applications should be completed and returned to your building principal. If you have children in more than one school, a separate application is required for each school. Additional applications are available at the school office, as is a complete school district policy statement for your review.

You will be notified by the principal as to the action taken on your request. Appeals to this determination may, if needed, be addressed in writing to the Attendence Supervisor of your Region.

Sincerely,

NORMAN DRACHLER,
Superintendent of Schools.

Subject: Adoption of new free lunch guidelines.
From: Howard W. Briggs, director, Food Service Department.
To: All principals and attendance supervisors.
Date: March 24, 1971.

Due to increased federal funds it has been possible for the Board of Education to liberalize the Guidelines for Free Lunches. Reduced Price Lunches will be eliminated and the guidelines previously used for Reduced Price Lunches will be used for Free Lunches, effective April 1, 1971.

Students who have applied for and qualified for Reduced Price Lunches, may now be given a free lunch as of April 1, 1971.

FREE LUNCH GUIDELINES

EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 1971

Families with gross income corresponding to the family size and income scales listed below qualify for a free lunch.

	Yearly income	Monthly income	Weekly income
Total family size:			
1	$2,075	$173	$40
2	2,760	230	53
3	3,375	281	65
4	4,025	335	77
5	4,620	385	89
6	5,215	434	100
7	5,750	479	110
8	6,300	525	121
For each additional family member add	485	40	9

FROM DENNIS M. DOYLE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

ESTIMATES OF NEEDY CHILDREN IN NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR AND REACHED WITH FREE OR REDUCED PRICE LUNCHES—MARCH 1971

Region/State	Number of children eligible	Number of children reached	Percent of eligible reached
Northeast:			
Connecticut	61,130	43,063	70.4
Delaware	15,363	12,884	83.9
District of Columbia	53,140	53,139	[1] 100.0
Maine	36,662	35,360	96.5
Maryland	101,262	132,722	[2] 131.1
Massachusetts	120,248	64,861	53.9
New Hampshire	10,110	9,035	89.4
New Jersey	125,321	113,677	90.7
New York	650,000	617,297	95.0
Pennsylvania	249,905	183,342	73.4
Rhode Island	17,000	15,910	93.6
Vermont	23,156	10,694	46.2
West Virginia	112,508	102,513	91.9
Regional total	1,575,805	1,394,517	88.5
Southeast:			
Alabama	262,801	255,174	97.1
Florida	375,573	260,887	69.5
Georgia	309,014	314,431	[3] 101.8
Kentucky	158,284	162,813	[4] 102.9
Mississippi	248,086	240,038	96.8
North Carolina	301,463	314,808	[3] 104.4
Puerto Rico	448,500	379,381	84.6
South Carolina	213,663	216,400	[3] 101.3
Tennessee	220,816	198,479	89.9
Virginia	216,869	203,197	93.7
Virgin Islands	16,632	16,632	[5] 100.0
Regional total	2,771,701	2,562,240	92.4
Midwest:			
Illinois	265,000	261,134	98.5
Indiana	90,500	76,098	84.1
Iowa	80,531	57,241	71.1
Michigan	224,244	139,849	32.5
Minnesota	134,900	131,022	97.1
Missouri	153,969	111,703	72.5
Nebraska	52,499	42,556	81.1
North Dakota	19,337	18,155	93.9
Ohio	191,827	168,639	87.9
South Dakota	27,558	24,151	87.6
Wisconsin	71,583	74,548	[3] 104.1
Regional total	1,311,948	1,038,041	79.1

ESTIMATES OF NEEDY CHILDREN IN NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR AND REACHED WITH FREE OR REDUCED PRICE LUNCHES—MARCH 1971—Continued

Region/State	Number of children eligible	Number of children reached	Percent of eligible reached
Southwest:			
Arkansas	130, 971	133, 201	[6] 101.7
Colorado	102, 181	66, 234	64.8
Kansas	52, 933	39, 466	74.6
Louisiana	277, 380	308, 324	[3] 111.2
New Mexico	94, 058	89, 545	95.2
Oklahoma	119, 825	91, 076	76.0
Texas	587, 322	531, 269	90.5
Regional total	1, 364, 670	1, 259, 115	92.3
Western:			
Alaska	15, 941	13, 604	85.3
Arizona	59, 741	56, 180	94.0
California	1, 000, 000	533, 799	53.4
Guam	2, 700	1, 910	70.7
Hawaii	17, 237	14, 573	84.5
Idaho	21, 159	14, 951	70.7
Montana	15, 223	13, 818	90.8
Nevada	8, 558	8, 185	95.6
Oregon	78, 610	47, 140	60.0
Samoa, American	8, 789	8, 789	[1] 100.0
Utah	31, 500	30, 121	95.6
Washington	87, 431	71, 050	81.2
Wyoming	7, 883	6, 321	80.2
Regional total	1, 354, 822	820, 441	60.6
Grand total	8, 378, 946	7, 074, 354	84.4

---

[1] Only number of eligibles being fed were reported. Does not include those eligibles who refuse a lunch.
[2] State is reviewing reporting procedures feeling they may have overstated participants.
[3] State feels reported figure is correct.
[4] State is taking new survey which will be available in about a month.
[5] No report received. Footnote 1 applies.
[6] State school lunch director out of office and no one else authorized to check figures.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1971.

MR. GERALD S. J. CASSIDY,
General Counsel, Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASSIDY: We are pleased to respond to the request made by Mr. Joe Kinney III for data on the Department's financial assistance to child nutrition programs in the 235 nonprofit private schools in Michigan. You will recall that Mr. Kinney's request was made of Mr. Dennis M. Doyle, Director, Midwest Regional Office, Food and Nutrition Service, at a May 26 meeting of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

The following is a cumulative report on financial assistance for child nutrition programs in Michigan's nonprofit private schools for the period July 1, 1970 through March 1971:

Section 4	$326, 117
Section 11	140, 531
Section 32	166, 004
Breakfast	5, 329
Nonfood assistance	6, 215
Special milk	646, 026
Special food service	159, 673
Total	1, 449, 895

Should the Committee desire complete data on fiscal 1971 expenditures for these schools, we would be pleased to furnish it when it becomes available.

I appreciate the Committee's interest in the Department's child nutrition programs.

Sincerely,

RICHARD LYNG,
Assistant Secretary.

FROM J. CRIS GRIER

FIVECAP, INC.,
Custer, Mich., May 12, 1971.

Mr. JAMES V. SPRINGFIELD, *Director,*
Food Stamp Division,
Food and Nutrition Service,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPRINGFIELD: This is directed to you in regard to the "Food Stamp Program Regulations" promulgated by the Food and Nutrition Service on April 16, 1971 from the Federal Register of December 30, 1970 (35 F.R. 19737) by the persons whose names are listed below, representing the (Michigan) State Coordinating Committee on Emergency Food and Medical Service. It is this committee's understanding that interested persons have thirty days from April 16, 1971 to respond to these "Regulations" before they become final and are effected. At a meeting of this committee on April 29 and 30, 1971, these persons voted to respond to those portions of the "Regulations" that specifically deal with "outreach" functions which are to inform persons of low-income status of the availability of Food Stamps and changes in the Food Stamp Program that could affect their participation in the Program.

Chapter II, Sections 270.3, 271.1, and 271.2 of the "Regulations" deal with this aspect of the Program, although, as you can see by the copy we have enclosed herein, not all reprints of these "Regulations" include those pertinent Sections in their entirety. This reprint copy and a number of others we received from the USDA Regional Office in Lansing, Michigan do not contain all provisions of those Sections. Nevertheless, we believe them important enough to poor people in Michigan—and elsewhere—to express our concern and support of these provisions.

In addition, this Committee representing more than ⅔ of the Community Action Agencies in Michigan believes it important and timely to draw your attention to the fact that the local Community Action Agencies in Michigan and in Region V are and have been for some time actively engaged in this type of "outreach" because of their commitment to carry out just these types of functions, namely, informing the poor and income-disadvantaged of the resources available to them through all programs, including those of the United States Department of Agriculture. Through the (OEO) Emergency Food and Medical Service Program, and others, Outreach Workers, usually para-professionals hired from below the poverty line themselves, have been working diligently to do this. Reports from various agencies on their participants and activity and the information on (hunger) need and programs each has available on its own, local area bear this out. As a result, Community Action Agencies have the "know how." They have the staff (or can readily add to them and train them); they have developed the contacts; they know their communities and the areas of need.

We, therefore, believe that we cannot urge you and the Food and Nutrition Service strongly enough to take this most seriously into consideration as the final policies for the Food Stamp Program are developed and implemented—even to the point of "spelling-out" that the "outreach" aspect of the Program would be appropriately lodged with the Community Action Agencies and that funds to carry this out be made available to the Community Action Agencies through the respective Regional Offices.

We realize time is short. We realize also that the need is there among the poor. We thank you for your consideration of this proposal, await your early reply, and appreciate whatever positive action you can take on this.

Sincerely,

J. CRIS GRIER,
Program Director, FIVECAP, Inc.

ITEM 2—MATERIAL FROM OTHER THAN WITNESSES

FROM MRS. DENISE LEWIS

JUNE 3, 1971.

MRS. DENISE LEWIS,
Secretary-Director,
Commission on Community Relations,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MRS. LEWIS: Your statement in support of feeding hungry children and in particular supporting a more expanded and effective school lunch program is indeed appreciated.

The Commission's remarks will be made part of the hearing record.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

CITY OF DETROIT, COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY RELATIONS,
Detroit, Mich., May 27, 1971.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition,
Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: After reviewing the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of 1970, which declares it to be "the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the nation's children" through the school lunch program, the Commission on Community Relations was shocked to learn that free lunches are not being served to fully 83,000 of the 127,000 eligible children in the Detroit Public Schools. What is more shocking is that only 2000 children are participating in the free breakfast program.

These figures have to be seen in the light of the recent research findings that: (1) malnutrition and anemia are far more prevalent than previously thought, particularly among low-income families, and (2) hunger's effect on the nervous system causes monumental impediments to the learning process which can be just as restrictive of the potential of our children as brain injuries.

The national interest in removing these impediments should transcend any desire to decentralize the Federal establishment. Emergency steps must be taken to rescue our children from the permanently crippling effects of hunger, even if it means radical departure from traditional patterns of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

The State of Michigan and the Detroit Public Schools are currently having difficulty raising the necessary revenue to take care of their other responsibilities. This nation cannot afford to allow children to go unfed simply because of state and local government revenue problems or traditional notions of Federalism.

As another example of the same problem, the Summer Lunch Program that was so successful in the poverty target areas of Detroit last summer is also threatened with being scuttled because the Department of Agriculture is insisting that the "local share" be a cash contribution. In 1970, volunteer help was counted as the "local share," and the program was, in the judgement of the Commission, extremely successful.

The Commission respectfully submitted the following recommendations:

FINANCING

(1) The Federal Government should be responsible for not less than 100% of the cost of feeding all children eligible for a free lunch and breakfast—i.e., the cost of all necessary food plus the cost of processing, packaging, distributing, transporting, storing, handling, serving, and accounting for all food necessary to feed all eligible children a free hot breakfast and lunch.

(2) The Federal Government should be responsible for all of the cost of the "reduced price lunch" program over and above that paid by the eligible children.

Staffing

(1) The added duty of bookkeeping for the lunch program, which is now being handled in many schools by teaching personnel, should be transferred to persons hired from the community specifically for this purpose and paid for by the Federal Government.

(2) The Federal Government should provide as many additional group-feeding experts as necessary to manage an expanded breakfast and lunch program that will effectively reach all needy children.

Facilities

(1) The Federal Government should make immediate provisions for adequate facilities, including mobile kitchens, in the inner city and other schools to provide every eligible child with a hot breakfast and lunch.

(2) The Federal Government should make provisions for adequate permanent cooking and eating facilities in all the schools that are in need of them.

It is clear to the Commission, after 27 years of working on the problem of inequality in American life, that unless unprecedented efforts are made to overcome the totality of inequalities in our society, ranging from nutrition and health care to vocational education and employment, we will make little progress in the next 27 years.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Denise Lewis,
Secretary-Director.

May 27, 1971.

Mrs. Irene H. Svilokos,
Director, Food Services, Center Line Public Schools, Center Line, Mich.

Dear Mrs. Svilokos: Thanks very much for letting me see the copy of "The Innovator" of May, 1971 at the conclusion of the hearing. I ordered the first page, the story on the lunch program, printed as part of our hearing record.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Philip A. Hart.

ITEM 3—NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

[From the Detroit Free Press, May 27, 1971]

SCHOOL LUNCH FAILURES CITED

(By Susan Holmes)

More than 100,000 needy youngsters in Michigan are excluded from a federally backed school lunch program because of a lack of money and lunchroom facilities, a U.S. Senate committee on nutrition was told in Detroit Wednesday.

In Detroit alone, committee members were told, about 82,000 poor children out of 127,000 who qualify for free or reduced-price lunches do not get them.

The testimony on the failure of the school lunch program in Michigan came during the last day of a two-day hearing in Michigan by the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition.

Chaired by Sen. Philip A. Hart, D-Mich., Wednesday's daylong session in the Veterans Memorial repeatedly produced statistics showing that about 40 percent of the state's 300,000 needy youngsters do not receive the subsidized school lunches.

The percentage of poor youngsters not receiving the lunches in Detroit is even greater, said Howard W. Briggs, food service director for the Detroit Public Schools. But, he said, the number of needy youngsters in Detroit who participate in the lunch program under the National School Lunch Act has increased substantially since 1970.

"It is necessary for us to feed a large number of students in very limited facilities, and it is extremely difficult to accomplish this task without some infringement on the classes that use the same room before and after lunch," he said.

Similar sentiments were expressed by Mrs. Mary Ellen Riordan, president of the Detroit Federation of Teachers, and Martin Kalish, president of the Organization of Administrators and Supervisors in Detroit.

Kalish criticized the lunch program because, he said, it provides subsidized lunches to children who do not actually need them.

"Children from homes in other programs such as Aid to Dependent Children and welfare should not automatically be included in the free lunch program," he said, "We cannot continue to over burden our lunchroom facilities with children who have no poverty need and are remaining in school for the convenience of the parent.

"The federal lunch program does little for education when it provides funds essentially to cover the cost of food without providing for facilities and equipment.

"The impossibility of feeding children in present facilities must be obvious to anyone who has ever been in a Detroit elementary school."

Hart and about a half dozen of his committee aides visited Detroit's Pingree Elementary School, 3917 McClellan, where an average of 400 of the 695 students participate in the federal lunch program.

Jack Feldstein, school principal, said about 600 youngsters qualify for the program at the school, but that it lacks the facilities to handle them.

Hart watched as a string of youngsters ate a hot lunch of chop suey, peas, roll and butter, milk and a cookie. Many of the youngsters, about 350, get free lunches with the others paying a minimal fee for the lunch.

Hart, like many of the youngsters, left his peas on his plate. After visiting the school, Hart said he hoped to use the findings from the Michigan hearings to press for more money for the program and also to make changes necessary to operate it more efficiently.

The National School Lunch Act provided Michigan with $19 million for fiscal 1971 to feed needy youngsters.

○